

OF
THE ATROCIOUS PLOT

FORMED BY
CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS
AGAINST THE
CLERGY AND NUNS OF LOWER CANADA,
THROUGH THE INTERVENTION, OF
MARIA MONK.

WITH AN AUTHENTIC NARRATIVE OF HER LIFE, FROM HER BIRTH TO THE
PRESENT MOMENT AND AN ACCOUNT OF HER IMPOSITIONS, ETC.

Auri sacra fames quid non mortalite pectora cogit

NEW-YORK :
PRINTED FOR JONES & CO. OF MONTREAL.
1836.

Entered, according to the act of Congress, in the year 1836,
by S. ADAMS, in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the
Southern District of New-York.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Pamphlet of the "Awful Disclosures" is trifling in bulk, but charged with undisguised malignity and clumsy misrepresentations. The object of it is no less than to inflict irretrievable injury on the reputation and efficiency of the ministers of the Roman Catholic faith in Lower Canada, and on the hitherto unblemished fame of the Conventual institutions of that province. Let it be admitted that such a work might be undertaken with a conscientious persuasion of its justice and necessity, the public would still look for and expect to find strong and unquestionable evidence in justification of the act of the accusers. If that evidence were really produced, it would indeed be difficult to over-estimate the importance of the question between Maria Monk and her supporters on the one hand, and the Catholic clergy and religious establishments of Lower Canada on the other. If inquiry should substantiate and prove the charges against these latter, it would then become a question whether piety, charity, humility, or Christian virtue, had any real abiding place upon earth. For it would follow, that men visibly engaged through a long course

of years in the active discharge of the most sacred functions, may nevertheless be stained by the habitual indulgence of the blackest crimes; and that women, whose vows consecrate them to the service of God, and who fulfil those vows in works of mercy to God's creatures, may at the same time be plunged deep in revolting sensuality. Individual hypocrisy may be allowed and credited without seriously affecting our belief in human virtue; but hypocrisy so extensive as that charged in the work we are considering, if proved and unveiled, would shake to the very foundation our faith in the existence of religion and morality. The very nature of that hypocrisy is in itself monstrous and appalling. You who have read the "Awful Disclosures," look at the picture which is presented to your understandings! Contemplate the demand which is made on your credulity! Mark that aged woman watching over the bed of the pestilential and the dying; mark her fearless intrepidity, her self-abnegation, and her merciful ministrations! See! her hand smooths the pillow of that tossed and troubled man, she carries to his lips the reposing draught, he sleeps! Now see if you can—if your vision will admit the picture, if your understanding will admit the belief, that same woman, in the broad glare of the next day's sun, doing a deed of *Murder*! Mark that man in the habiliments of a servant of God! Where is he? What does he? He stands at the side of the plague-stricken, he administers the last rites of

Religion—he prays, and his words carry hope and consolation to the dying. Again, look and behold that identical being treading with stealthy pace his way to the commission of hideous debauchery within the precincts of an HOSPITAL.

There is no exaggeration in these contrasts. The duties of the nuns and priests have been and are such as we have ascribed to them.— Now we ask the ten thousand readers of the book, if the deeds therein alleged are not incompatible with human nature,—if any thing that is known of man's capacity for crime can render them credible? Scrutinize the annals of vice, and where will be found any thing approaching the horrors imputed in the "Disclosures," to the Roman Catholic clergy and orders of Lower Canada? Protestant historians, in dwelling on the enormities of the Catholics in the worst of times, have never charged them with the turpitudes related in this book. Luther, the violent and ruthless Luther, in justification of his attacks on the Roman Catholic church, never urged the existence of corruption so horrible. This remark applies with still greater force to his fellow-laborers and successors. At the close of the last century, and in enervated Italy, the Grand Duke of Tuscany ordered an inquiry into the state of the religious establishments within his dominions; and the result of the inquiry was, that reform was judged necessary. Ricci, bishop of Pistoia, was appointed by his sovereign to conduct and bring to a termination that reform. The life of Ricci has been writ-

ten by an acute historian, and in no friendly spirit to the church of Rome. It was considered that in that work the worst was said, and the worst was proved, that could be advanced against the Conventual system. The debased civilization of the country where the reform was undertaken, opposed but a feeble barrier to the practice of vice in every condition and class of society, and it was not surprising that some corruption should have penetrated into the holiest sanctuaries. The existence of the corruption was however known to the Tuscans previously to the legal inquiry. They cared not for it, nor murmured against it. How different is the case with Canada! Its population, seated in a region of snow and ice, is primitive, moral, and strictly religious. The people neither know of nor suspect the existence of corruption among their priests. The few convents in the country are in the nature of seminaries for the instruction of youth, and asylums for the poor and wretched. There are none others. In Tuscany, the convents which were found to require reform, were close convents; that is to say, their inmates never came in contact with the people, either as nurses to the sick, teachers of youth, or ministrators of the helpless. But, notwithstanding these differences more favorable to the existence of corruption in one case than in the other, the deeds alleged in the life of Ricci must appear comparatively innocent to the believer in the enormities detailed by the writer of "Passages in the Life of Maria Monk." Is there such a

man? We know not; but if there is, he must be possessed of a mind capable of dwelling on the possible blood-thirstiness of a William Penn, or the possible misanthropy of a Howard.

Turn we now to the supporters of this work, and let us ask, where is the evidence in justification of the unheard of charges they have brought? Let them point to it. Will they have the hardihood to pretend that the testimony of an unhappy female, recently imprisoned for theft, and still more recently the inmate of an Asylum for repentant sinners, will serve such purpose? Does the corroboration of a man repudiated by his class for dishonesty and speculation—the paramour of their wretched protege—does it give assurance of their conscientious persuasion? Is it even true that they have produced the evidence of the thief and prostitute? Is the book which bears her name, really written by Maria Monk? Impossible, for she is in fact, and by her own confession, an ignorant and uneducated girl. It cannot be received as her own evidence, although produced in her name. It may be alleged that all the materials were obtained from her own lips, and that the editor or editors have merely arranged for the public eye the matter she supplied. In that case they have been guilty of tampering with the evidence, a misdemeanor for which there is no excuse nor palliation. We again refer to the life of Ricci as an unexceptionable model in this respect. There the minutes of all the examinations which occurred in the

course of Ricci's inquiry, with day and date, and names of witnesses and of parties, are minutely set down. In the "Awful Disclosures," *there is not a single date from the commencement to the end!* The work announces a disgusting alliance between false christianity and female profligacy of the worst description. In Canada, this attempt to unite the ravings, puerilities, and loathsome fabrications of a disturbed intellect with the ends of piety and religion, was received with nothing but contempt; but in the United States the work has, as we are told, gone through two editions of ten thousand copies each, and has been circulated by the zeal of fanatical and interested propagandists throughout the entire land. It has even been publicly recommended from the pulpit as an antidote to the "errors of Popery;" and the heroine has been honored by reports of hair-breadth escapes and of defeated conspiracies for her abduction.

We would fain have believed that religious fanaticism, in its more odious form of gross calumny and pernicious hatred, had nearly departed from the civilized world; but the reception given to the "Awful Disclosures" of Maria Monk shows that it still has an extended habitation in a country claiming to be pre-eminently enlightened, and that in that country it may one day become the stirrer of intestine trouble, rapine, and bloodshed. There, the very men who abjure the interference of the civil power to procure conformity to their sectarian faith, do not hesitate to resort to private persecution, se-

cret intrigue, and the rash and culpable adoption of idle and flimsily constructed stories, to attain their ends. The principle is in both cases the same, although differently manifested. It will be in vain for the supporters of Monk to protest the sincerity of their belief in her pretended narrative.—The question, why believe? still remains unsatisfied. Have they anticipated the question? They have not. Are they looking about for evidence to sustain their pre-judgment? They notoriously are, and in this consists the infamy of their conduct. We are right in describing as infamous the conduct of men, whether lay or clerical, who have come before the world and preferred the most atrocious charges, in the hope or expectation that subsequent events might demonstrate them to be true, or that they might with their sanction pass with the mass without further examination. To believe things that are not, and cannot be, is a chapter in the history of man; whether his credulity has been rightly calculated upon in the case before us, we have no opportunity of determining; but much has been done to influence him, and men of a sacred calling have sacrilegiously abused their opportunities, and presented from the altar of God the poison to his lips, gilded with a blasphemous application of the language of the Holy Writ.

We should have supposed *a priori* that the marked inconsistencies of this scandalous work would have sufficed to render its effects on most readers comparatively innocuous; we hoped at

least that it would speedily have sunk into oblivion, and have been allowed to rot, forgotten amidst the mass of falsehood and impurity which disgraces a portion of the New-York press; but it would seem, from the notices which appear from time to time in the periodicals, that it is determined to persist in the system of falsehood so shamefully commenced. A reply has been deemed necessary.

It is here offered with a feeling of deep regret on the part of the author, that the tissue of horrors which calls it forth should have ever been thought or printed. It will be necessary to place before the public gaze persons whose habits and inclinations especially fit them for retirement, and who might reasonably have expected to have walked through life in the peaceful and undisturbed discharge of their pious avocations. The necessity of invading the privacy of the good, the charitable, and the humble, weighed strongly with the author as an objection to making any reply whatever to the "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk;" but the opinion of wise and reflecting men, that they should no longer be suffered to remain uncontradicted before the world, has prevailed. It only remains to add, that the reply here presented is complete, that it is sustained by authenticated documents and indisputable evidence; and that nothing will be advanced in the text, the truth of which has not been ascertained by careful investigation and personal observation. Is it too much to hope that this refutation of the "Awful Dis-

tures" will be favorably received by a generous and discerning public,—generous, we trust, in behalf of calumniated innocence, and discerning between truth and falsehood.

CHAPTER I

A brief account of the Conventual Establishments of the City of Montreal.

Congregation de Notre-Dame.

THIS institution was founded in the seventeenth century, by Margaret Bourgeois, born at Troyes in Champaign. In her thirty-third year she abandoned her native country, and arrived at Montreal in the year 1653. Her life appears to have been marked by those acts which immortalize the friends of humanity. Her historian thus describes the scene of her labours. "Fifty houses, dispersed here and there, within the limits of a fort defended by stakes, composed the settlement. Their inhabitants, together with a few families, French and Indian, scattered over the neighbouring country, composed the entire population. It was the daily practice of Sister Bourgeois to visit almost every house within and without the fort. Her ordinary occupations consisted in attending the sick, consoling the afflicted, instructing the ignorant, in washing and mending for the helpless, and in burying the dead." At the expiration of five years thus spent, the sister returned to France in search of companions to a toil which became too great to be properly discharged by a single person. She arrived a second time at Montreal, in September, 1659, and, with her companions, was accommodated with a stable, the only dwelling in which the missionaries could obtain rest from the fatigues of their journey. In that stable, and on the 25th of November, 1659,

was opened the first school established in the city of Montreal. The day is still annually commemorated. Many years elapsed before the congregation became possessed of the soil on which the convent is now erected; but in 1698 we find the sisters, already numerous, established within their present limits. In the same year they received from the hands of the Bishop the rules of their foundation, which have not since been altered; and also made in his presence the simple vows of poverty, chastity, obedience, and of instruction of persons of their own sex, together with the vow of stability in their profession.

Hotel Dieu.—This institution was founded in 1644, by the Duchess of Bouillon. Her immediate representative in Canada was Jane Manse, who administered during her lifetime the “property of the poor” in the hospital of the *Hotel Dieu* of Montreal. The following extract from the Memoranda of an American traveller, who visited the *Hotel Dieu* in 1825, describes, in eloquent language, the occupations of the nuns. “We were shown the Hospital, which contains a Laboratory, Dispensary, and two large halls for the sick. In the first room the nuns were preparing medicines, making extracts, decoctions, essences, and all that the apothecary could find a name for; which were afterwards placed in the Dispensary in the neatest manner; and this room made a fine appearance, although there were no blue or yellow waters, which make so great a show in our apothecary shops when seen through glass vessels of exquisite clearness. The hall for male patients was on the ground floor; and, notwithstanding it was excessively warm in the streets that day (July 16th, 1825), yet, be-

tween these massy walls of stone and lime there was a refreshing coolness ; the change of temperature was felt the instant we entered the room. Here these delicate women were seen exercising the skill of a physician, and the tenderness and patience of a mother or wife at a sick bed ; and these charities and this tenderness were bestowed, not upon kindred and friends, but upon humble beings, unknown to these Sisters of Charity before misfortunes and disease had come upon them. Some of these wretched beings would have perished without such succour. Humble as they were, there were no hirelings about their pillows—no anodynes were administered to them, that their nurses might enjoy unbroken slumbers ; but every attention which wealth and affection could command in a populous city, was found here. The female apartment for the sick was, if possible, still more convenient. There was an air of taste and comfort about every thing in this room, which seemed to half cure disease at the first look of the means to do it. It often happens, such are the accommodations for the sick here, that others than the poor and destitute come here to be healed, and leave the place, if not under pecuniary obligations, at least with a deep sense of gratitude for kind offices. I noticed one young woman lying on her bed, whom the nuns approached with great affection and kindness, bringing every little delicacy to tempt a sickly appetite ; now and then a small cup of cooling beverage, to moisten her parched lips ; and the nuns, as they sat by her side or passed along on duty, often, in gentle tones, let fall sweet words of consolation to the sufferer. Even the soft western breeze, so reviving in that excessive heat, was not allowed to

visit her directly, but its current was broken by a screen, round which the air was wafted on the balmy wings of love and healing. I learnt that this fair invalid had been there twice before, and had, in a good measure, recovered; but it was all over with her now. The death tones of her voice—the preternatural illuminations of her eyes—the steadfast gaze—the sudden change to a quick twinkling of those orbs from that fixed look—and, added to all, that saintly smile which was frequently seen on her lip at every kindness, were to my mind irresistible proofs that her dissolution was near; and it required but little imagination at that moment to think that some angel was then whispering

“Sister spirit, come away.”

Every thing in this institution was active, yet composed; all were busy; but there was no bustling. Religion and Charity, hand in hand, were walking their rounds of duty. There were no repining beauties here, under thick veils, breathing half-smothered curses at parental cruelty. Nothing but the sanctity of the place to remind one of the *Paraclete*, nor of

—“Those deep solitudes, and awful cells,
Where pleasing, heavenly contemplation dwells,
And ever-musing melancholy reigns.”

The costume of these nuns is one of ease, and not destitute of grace. The large sleeves in any female dress is generally becoming, and almost every dress is graceful in which perfect neatness is a striking feature.”

It is pleasing to be able to turn from the atra-

bilarious inventions of madmen and fanatics to the dignified and merited eulogium of a liberal and well informed mind.

General Hospital.—This institution was founded in 1753 by Madame de Youville, as a refuge for the infirm, poor, and invalids. It has also a department for patients labouring under mental derangement, and another for foundlings.

The revenues of the three foundations are expended for their appropriate objects. The veneration with which they are regarded by the people, Protestant and Catholic, proceeds from the charities they exercise, and which can neither be disguised nor simulated.

CHAPTER II.

Misrepresentations contained in the "Awful Disclosures," concerning the discipline and internal management of the Convents.

THE very points on which information may most easily be obtained by a stranger or by the inquiring traveller, are in part ignorantly, and in part wilfully misrepresented in this "artless" production. The names, occupations, and holding in the public estimation of the sisterhood of the three Convents, are in most instances either malignantly distorted or stupidly confounded. Intelligent readers are afflicted with a stubborn and inconvenient habit of inquiring into statements of every description, whether of great or apparently small importance. It will appear in the course of this refutation why it was impossible for the pseudo-writer of the "Awful Disclosures" to have furnished correct information

concerning the discipline of the convents. In the meantime we shall point out a few of the errors of detail, with which the pamphlet abounds.

Speaking of the nuns of the Congregational Nunnery, it is stated that they are sometimes called "Sisters of Charity." This is not true. The order of the "Sisters of Charity" has no existence in Canada, and the only name, either in French or English, by which the nuns of the Congregational Nunnery are collectively distinguished, is, "Sisters of the Congregation!"

It is stated that some of the nuns belonging to the Congregational Nunnery "are established as instructresses in different parts of the United States." This is not true. There are not, and never have been, instructresses from that convent sent to any part of the United States. The rules of the foundation expressly limit the labours of the sisterhood to Canada.

The account given of the instruction afforded to pupils in the Congregational Nunnery is false; it is not even sustained by plausible allegations. It is true that the education bestowed in that establishment is not brilliant, and that the accomplishments which a state of society differing from that of Canada requires, are not there cultivated; but on the other hand, it is undeniable that the branches which help to make the notable woman, that best ornament of domestic life, are carefully attended to. The moral and religious instruction of the pupils is a chief object, and their parents are grateful and satisfied. We must not be misunderstood when we say the education is not brilliant; it is elegant and refined, and will not suffer, in this respect, by comparison with any modern boarding-school; but

chemistry is, we are afraid, sadly neglected, and conchology held in light esteem. It is stated, that the nuns had no very regular parts assigned them in the management of the "Schools." Assuming that this refers to the Congregational School, it is false. Regularity, in all things, is the soul of Conventual establishments, and could not be neglected in the instance mentioned, without great public scandal. It is alleged that "the nuns were rather rough and unpolished in their manners." Roughness is not characteristic of French Canadians in any situation of life; moreover, as inmates of convents, the natural disposition of Canadian females is assisted by the sanction of religion and of religious rule. Of the polish of the sisterhood it does not appear that the author of the "Disclosures" was capable of forming an opinion. It is alleged that they (the nuns) would often exclaim, "c'est un menti," (that's a lie,) and "mon Dieu" (my God,) on the most trivial occasions. Respecting the first expression, it must have escaped the learned correctors for the press, that "c'est un menti," is not the French for "that's a lie," or for any thing else:—"mon dieu" is an habitual expression with the French women, who do not attach to it the solemn meaning of the English version. This impertinent and foolish opinion on the labours of the sisterhood of the Congregational Nunnery in the instruction of youth, is not creditable to the skill of the authors of the "Disclosures." Their "Disclosures" are often more than hazardous. They must have calculated largely on the pliability of their readers when they allowed such stuff as the following to go to press: "their (the nuns) writing was quite poor, and it was not uncommon for

them to put a capital in the middle of a word." "The only book on Geography which we (the pupils) studied, was a Catechism of Geography, from which we learnt by heart a few questions and answers." "We were sometimes referred to a map, but it was only to point out Montreal or Quebec, or some other prominent name; while we had no instruction beyond." And again,—“it would require only a proper examination to prove, that with the exception of needle-work, hardly any thing is taught, excepting prayers and the catechism; the methods ‘of teaching’ were very imperfect.” When we come to examine the worth and capability of the witness, the reader will see how little fitted that witness was to give any testimony on the above matters.

It is stated, that “some of the priests of the seminary often visited the Congregational Nunnery, and both catechised and talked with us (the pupils) on religion.” The errors here are circumstantial, and such as a person speaking confidently on hasty inquiry would be apt to make. To have made the statement correct, it should have been written, “The chaplain of the Congregational Nunnery often said mass in our chapel, and occasionally exhorted us on religion.” We will not say that the representation made in the “Disclosures” is in any respect offensive; no, it is simply incorrect, and made by an ignorant person.

It is stated that “the superior of the “Black Nunnery” adjoining, also occasionally came into the school, and enlarged on the advantages we (the pupils) enjoyed in having such teachers; and dropped something now and then relating to her own convent, calculated to make us entertain the

highest ideas of it, and to make us sometimes think of the possibility of getting into it." Such some may regard as the language of artless simplicity, but we know it to be the fabrication of clumsy knavery. Even Protestants may know that it would be directly contrary to the rules and customs of such establishments for the superior of one convent to visit the interior of another entirely independent of her control, and there indulge in such interference as is mentioned. Were she so inclined, she would not be suffered to do it by the superior of the convent so visited, and who is bound to guard against any infringement of the privileges of the institution over which she presides. Moreover, it is known to the pupils of the Congregation, that the superior and nuns of the Hotel Dieu are bound by their vows never to leave the precincts of their convent. What she "dropped now and then relating to her own convent, calculated to make us entertain the highest ideas of it" is not mentioned. Did she "now and then" give the assembled children an insight into the practices which are elsewhere described in the "Awful Disclosures?" Miserable and disgusting falsehood!

It is stated that the instructions given to the pupils were particularly directed against the Protestant Bible, and the charge is made in suitable language. They often "enlarged upon the evil tendency of that book, and told us, that but for it many a soul now condemned to hell, and suffering eternal punishment, might have been in happiness. They could not say any thing in its favour, for that would be speaking against religion and against God. They warned us against its woe, and represented it as a thing very dangerous to our souls."

Have we not here a specimen of the fanatical exaggeration which may be heard in any New-York conventicle where the practice and doctrine of Catholics, in relation to the Scriptures, are introduced? It is utterly incredible, nay, impossible in the ordinary course of things, that the language ascribed to the priests should have been used by them: but it is well known that it is daily invented for them by their detractors, and by the real enemies of the Word of God.

It is stated that the religious instruction of the pupils at the Congregational Nunnery was conducted by the priests, and that unwritten questions and answers were proposed during the hours of instruction, which the pretended writer of the "Disclosures" has managed to retain "*with tolerable accuracy.*" We believe that the following intelligible, probable, and consistent dialogue is copied with "*tolerable accuracy*" from the "Disclosures."

Ques. Pourquoi le bon Dieu n'a pas fait tous les commandemens?

Reponse. Parceque l'homme n'est pas si fort qu'il peut garder tous les commandemens.

Ques. Why did not God make all the commandments?

Ans. Because man is not strong enough to keep them.

Ques. Pourquoi l'homme ne lit pas l'Evangile?

Reponse. Parceque l'esprit de l'homme est trop borné et trop faible pour comprendre qu'est ce que Dieu a écrit?

Ques. Why are not men to read the New Testament?

Ans. Because the mind of man is too limited and weak to understand what God has written!

We have already intimated that the only priest who visits the Congregational Nunnery, is the official chaplain for the time being ; and it is positively false that he interferes in the religious instruction of the pupils, except incidentally and in the discharge of his duties as chaplain. The alleged interference would be contrary to the rules of the foundation. The catechism is taught, and the principles of religion are explained by the nuns, who are fully competent to discharge that duty. It is therefore impossible that the writer of the "Disclosures" should be able to recall, "even with tolerable accuracy," language which, from the very nature of the institution, could never have been uttered within its walls. Moreover, we may remark, that the first question and answer do not present an intelligible meaning—a circumstance which we are bound to suppose assisted the mind of the witness in "recalling with tolerable accuracy ;" and that the second is at variance with the known doctrine and practice of the Catholic church and its members, lay and clerical. There are other circumstances connected with this statement, which heighten its absurdity. The French given in the "Disclosures" is really not French, and of course the English, which purports to be a translation, is in all probability the invention of some defamatory conventicle. The method, *unwritten* questions and answers, could never have been resorted to by reasoning beings for any purpose, good or bad. It does not even appear that pains were taken to impress them on the memory, as it is simply stated that the pupils did not "read them," and that they "were taught them only by word of mouth!" The written catechism referred to in the "Disclosures," contains all the command-

ments which Catholics are bound to observe. The priests, in their alleged unwritten catechism, could not present others without subjecting themselves to the obvious criticism, even of children.

It is stated that "the nuns had a private confession-room in the building," and that "the boarders were taken in parties through the streets on different days, by some of the nuns, to confess in the church (of the parish);" it is added, that this was not necessary at the "Black Nunnery," as there were there "a chapel, and priests attending in the Confessionals." This statement contains an untruth direct, and an untruth by implication. It is untrue that "the nuns had a private confession-room in the building;" confessions are never heard within the building, except in cases of sickness. It is implied that the Congregational Nunnery has no chapel attached to it; this is an untruth, and an untruth clumsily constructed, for, speaking of a first visit to the Congregational School, the writer is made to say, "we walked some distance along the side of a building towards the chapel." We have examined all the representations concerning the Congregational Nunnery, and we have shown them to be false in every instance. We found the allegations to be such, that it was possible to refute them without reference to the personal character or trustworthiness of the witness; but when we come to that branch of our subject, the effrontery and culpability of the editors of the "Disclosures" will be rendered even more conspicuous than they must now appear.

The statements and charges concerning the Hotel Dieu hospital are of a mingled description. Some of them must rest on the evidence of the woman whose name appears on the title-page of the

“Disclosures,” and of individuals mentioned in the narrative ; others regard matters of public notoriety, and to public notoriety and the experience of every citizen of Montreal we shall appeal in refutation of them. More the reader will not deem necessary in reply to a public prostitute, and the canting hypocrites who have undertaken to stand between her and the public as pledges for her “holiness and veracity.”

It is stated that “there are a number of veiled nuns of that convent (the Hotel Dieu), who spend most of their time there (in the hospital).” It is true that the nuns spend most of their time “in the hospital,” such is their charitable profession ; but it is untrue that any of them are “veiled,” if by this word the concealment of the countenance is implied.

Speaking of the employment of the nuns and novices, it is stated “that a rich carpet, made and finished in the convent, was sent to the king of England as an expression of gratitude for the money annually received from the government.” This is positively untrue ; such carpet never was “made and finished in the convent.” The Hospital of the Hotel Dieu owes no gratitude to the king of England personally for favours received ; their feelings towards his majesty are such as they share in common with their fellow-subjects,—respect and loyalty to the chief magistrate of an empire, by whose power and justice they are protected in their privileges as public benefactors.

The Word of God is the Christian’s text, Protestants and Catholics equally revere it ; but it has been the constant aim of impostors to impugn that reverence and dispute its existence. We are not sur-

prised to find in the "Disclosures" the following *artless* statements. "The priests would also take a verse or two, and preach from it (the New Testament). As for St. Paul, I remember as I was taught to understand it, that he was once a great persecutor of Roman Catholics until he became convicted, and confessed to one of the *father confessors*, I don't know which." It is not mentioned what priests would "preach," nor where they preached in the manner stated; but it is well known that Roman Catholic clergymen are probably more given to scriptural quotation than the ministers of any other denomination; good taste is frequently offended by their excess in this particular. The contrary, which is an untruth, is implied by the *artless* insertion of the words "a verse or two." Moreover, we find here, as elsewhere, the attempt to create the impression that the whole body of priests are to be found interfering in the religious instruction and internal concerns of the convents. As in the case of the Congregational Nunnery, it is untrue that any priest beside the official chaplain visits the Hotel Dieu; and he does so for the especial purposes of saying mass in the chapel, and praying with and for the confined sick. In regard to the falsification of the scriptural account of St. Paul's conversion, we would ask, why even *priestly iniquity* should be supposed capable of committing it?

It is stated, that in the three convents—the Congregational Nunnery, the Grey Nunnery, and the Hotel Dieu—there are "certain apartments into which strangers can gain admittance, but others from which they are always excluded." As the same remark might be made of every building in exist-

ence, public or private, why is it here specially applied? With, it is obvious, the intent of prejudicing the mind of the ignorant reader against a species of seclusion which a moment's reflection would show is practised with even greater rigour in his own domicil. It cannot be said "there are certain apartments" in any private gentleman's house, "into which strangers can obtain admittance," even on applying to the owner for his leave. The apartments to which strangers visiting the convents are admitted, are those devoted to purposes in which the public are considered to have an interest; the apartments from which they are very properly excluded, are the bed-rooms and chambers of the sisterhood. Vulgar and insolent men have, in more instances than one, received from decorum and propriety the rebuff which their impertinent curiosity merited. The vengeance of such men finds its place in these "Awful Disclosures."

It is stated, that "From all that appears to the public eye, the nuns of these convents are devoted to the charitable objects appropriate to each—the labour of making different articles known to be manufactured by them, and the religious observances which occupy a large portion of their time. They are regarded with much respect by the people at large; and *now and then*, when a novice takes the veil, she is supposed to retire from the temptations and troubles of this world into a state of holy seclusion; where, by prayer, self-mortification, and good deeds, she prepares herself for Heaven." Such, we admit, is very nearly a true picture of the estimation in which the convents and their inmates are held by the people at large; what fol-

lows is less exact. "Sometimes the superior of a convent obtains the character of working miracles; and when such a one dies, it is published through the country, and crowds throng the convents, who think indulgences are to be derived from bits of her clothes or other things she has possessed; and many have sent articles, to be touched, to her bed or chair, in which a degree of virtue is thought to remain." Here we have manifestly another fabrication of the "conventicle." The passage is what an impudent impostor would be ready to apply to any convent in the world—in Spain, Portugal, or Italy. It is sufficient to say, that the statement, as far as regards the Montreal convents, is false, word for word.

Our enumeration of the notorious misrepresentations contained in the "Disclosures" might be much further extended. Some of them, not here mentioned, will be pointed out elsewhere. Those we have selected are sufficient to raise at least doubts on the credibility of a "witness," who, by her own pretensions, was placed beyond the possibility of error. She was a nun!

CHAPTER III.

*Manifest absurdities, contradictions, and falsehoods of the pretended
"DISCLOSURES."*

WE have contended that no man of integrity, honesty, or ordinary intelligence, would hesitate to pronounce *a priori* the narrative which bears Monk's name to be a tissue of ill-constructed lies from be-

ginning to end. We say, that the very narrative bears on the face of it the evidence of imposture ; and for this reason, among others, we have ventured to impugn the motives as well as the acts of the " teachers of the people," who had undertaken to uphold it. That we have not erred in expressly stigmatizing those persons as debased and disgraced by the touch of manifest falsehood, it is now our business to prove. It will appear that our materials are ample. A straight-forward, well-told consistent story may be plausible though fictitious ; but the story given on the authority of the woman Monk, has not even the most ordinary essentials of verisimilitude ; still less has it that cunning adaptation of means to ends which forms the great attraction of Nursery tales. If the " Awful Disclosures" have obtained credence, we do not see why even at this day the truth of Daniel De Foe's celebrated Stories of Dreams should be disputed. Both have been attended with the same success. The one procured the sale of "DRELCOURT ON DEATH," the other has dispersed, among tens of thousands of eager readers, "MONK ON MURDER."

At the very outset of the " Disclosures," some startling demands are made on our sympathy and credulity. Thus we are informed, that " according to her earliest recollections, her father was very attentive to his family ;" that " she may very probably have been taught by him a particular passage from the Bible," which often occurred to her " in after-life ;" that, " after his death" she " received no religious instruction at home ;" " that her mother neglected her children in this respect." She was therefore capable of judging her father's conduct at the age of six or seven, and of recollecting

the serious judgment then formed at a much subsequent period! The probability of "a *particular* passage from the Bible" having been taught her by her father while yet an infant, must have appeared to her present advisers most affecting; and the sacrifice of filial piety exhibited in her reflections on the mismanagement of her surviving parent, must have filled them with admiration! She proceeds to say, "To my want of religious instruction at home, and the ignorance of my Creator and my duty, which was its natural consequence, I think I can trace my introduction to convents!" She is made to "*think*" what it is morally impossible that any intelligent being could think. What connection did her prompters discover between her "want of religious instruction at home," and her entrance into a convent?

We request attention to the following passage. "When about six or seven years of age, I went to school to a Mr. Workman, a protestant, who taught in Sacrament Street, and remained there several months. There I learned to read and write, and arithmetic as far as division. All the progress I ever made in those branches was gained in that school, as I have never made any progress in them since." The progress made by a child "six or seven years of age," in "reading; writing, and arithmetic as far as division," is remarkable enough; but not quite so much so as the ability of the grown up woman to apply the acquirements of that age, *never improved upon*, to the composition of the "Awful Disclosures!"

The foolish absurdities of these pretended "Disclosures" crowd upon us as we proceed. She informs her readers, that "the schools taught by the

Congregational nuns are more numerous than some may imagine." Why her readers should imagine any thing on the subject, is not apparent ; but, by way of supplying the imaginations of her readers, she proceeds, in the very next sentence, to coin an absolute untruth, which we have already noticed, respecting those same nuns. When "about ten years old," the girl, whose judgment at the age of six or seven was so precocious, began to think seriously (!) about going to the Congregational school ! The time that elapsed between that moment of "serious thought" and her entrance into the school, is not mentioned. We repeat here, that the utter absence of dates from the pretended "Disclosures," ought in itself to have been sufficient to cause their rejection by a man of common sense and common honesty. The want of both may safely be imputed to the men who have presumed to say,—“Here is a narrative which bears on it the stamp of truth.” It is not stated at what age she entered the school, or in what year, or under what circumstances ; or whether on her mother’s application or otherwise ; or whether as a *poor* scholar or as a paying scholar ; or whether as a day scholar or as a boarder. All those things, essential to the verisimilitude of the narrative, and, one would suppose, so necessary to satisfy the minds of honest vouchers for its truth, are wholly past over without notice. Her introduction into the convent is briefly told. “I was conducted by some of my young friends.” These “young friends” she speaks of just before as “girls of her acquaintance,” who attended the school. “On my entrance,” she proceeds to say, “the superior met me, and told me first of all that I must always dip my fingers into the Holy water at her

door, cross myself, and say a short prayer ; and this she told me was always required of Protestants as well as Catholics. It must be remarked, that this interesting piece of information is vouchsafed to the new-comer in the school-room, and of course in the presence of her "young friends" and others there present. Thus, in the first place we are required to believe that the superior, a woman, it must be supposed, of some sense, advised the new-comer of a trifling observance before the occasion for that observance arrived, and even before a girl in Monk's situation could be expected to understand it ; for she had not as yet seen the superior, or the "door," or the threshold, or the "Holy water" into which she was to "dip her fingers." In the second place, we are required to believe that the superior did actually risk the loss of that esteem, in which, it is admitted, the convent was held, by requiring of a girl, with whose character she was unacquainted, practices forbidden by the religion in which that girl was brought up. These considerations do not appear to have weighed with her fanatical editors. Neither does it appear to have struck their apprehensions that it was ridiculously absurd to allow, that the opinions of a girl, whose sole knowledge, acquired "when about six or seven years of age," and in the space of some months, was limited to "reading, writing, and arithmetic as far as division," on the education received in the school, were worthy of belief and attention. That those opinions are defamatory, only renders their easy reception the more culpable. We have, in a previous chapter, pointed out the little foundation there was for them.

She remained, as is stated, "about two years" at

the Congregational school ; at what age or in what year she left it, is not mentioned ; but she does not hesitate to make a second sacrifice of her filial piety, in describing her condition while at home. "I soon became dissatisfied, having many and severe trials to endure at home, which my feelings will not permit me to describe." Why she conquered her feelings so far as to say so much as is conveyed in the above passage, or why the allusion to her mother, who is still living, was necessary to complete the "Awful Disclosures" of "Popish Iniquity," does not appear on the face of the narrative. While still at the school, she is told "one day" by "a girl thirteen years old," of the conduct of a priest at "confession," which "astonished her." The story has some of the requisites of rational evidence ; the time at which it was told is mentioned, "one day ;" also the place where it was told, the school-room, and the age of the narrator, are carefully described. Who could doubt its truth, particularly as it is stated that the girl thirteen years old informed her mother of it, "who expressed no anger nor disapprobation !" Another story is told her, by "a girl of the school," of a murder committed by a priest on the person of "a young Squaw." Why the priest murdered, and why he then ran away, are most ingeniously accounted for ; it is intimated as a reason for the latter, that timely notice was conveyed to him in a *note* by an *Indian* ! Such are the "Disclosures" which the Montreal priests are summoned to refute.

"At length I determined to become a Black nun," are the opening words of the third chapter of the "Disclosures." The "at length" is admirable. One would be apt to suppose that she has just been

describing her self-communings, her struggles against her vocation for a religious life, and the difficulties she encountered in obeying the call. There is nothing of the kind, and the force of the "at length" must remain a mystery until expounded by her present confessors. The probable truth of her having formed "the determination of becoming a Black nun," may be estimated by the context of the narrative. Among the inducing motives, the reader will rank "her ignorance of her Creator," her intercourse with the nuns of the Congregational Nunnery, described as dissatisfactory to her precocious intellect; the influence produced on her mind by the occasional lectures (which could never have been given) of the superior of the Black Nunnery; the stories told her of the priests while at the Congregational school, forming a portion of the information received from "her Catholic acquaintances in favour of their faith;" and finally, her positive knowledge that, as an inmate of the Hotel Dieu, her occupation through life would be that of a sick nurse; a pleasing prospect to a young girl, who could not, by her own confession, have been urged to it by religious feelings! "While out of the nunnery," she says in the preceding chapter, "I saw nothing of religion;" and while in the nunnery, she saw nothing but what was frivolous and repugnant to her feelings; her ears were saluted with tales of blood and debauchery! The absurdity of this part of the narrative might perhaps have been avoided, or at least concealed, by the editors proposing one simple question—"why did you *at length* determine?" They might have exhibited her acting without deliberation; but imbecility and knavery are closely allied.

We are not able to discover from the narrative that the slightest control was exercised over the actions of Monk from her earliest infancy. This is unaccounted for. She mentions, that on her first application to be received as a novice into the "Black Nunnery," the superior told her "that she must make some inquiries before she could give a decided answer." To whom the inquiries were put is not stated. "At length," at the expiration of a fortnight, she calls at the "Black Nunnery," and is forthwith admitted as a "novice!" How very artless! The year in which she thus entered and her age are omitted; but, to supply this deficiency, we are told that the day was "Thursday," and the hour, "about ten o'clock in the morning!" As to when she became a convert to the Catholic faith we are left in the dark; that she apparently was a convert at the time of her alleged entrance into the Hotel Dieu, may be inferred; that she really was, her preceding narrative renders incredible.

The "Awful Disclosures" make a pamphlet of 231 pages, twenty of which would be sufficient to contain all that relates to their ostensible purpose, the exposure of "Popish Iniquity." This object has been combined in the publication of the pamphlet with another of no less importance. Pages are filled up with the most frivolous and disgusting trash, and a book is produced, the sale of which yields some seven or eight thousand dollars to the parties concerned. We see that a certain P. Gordon has ventured to put his name as proprietor of the copyright. We trust that all honest men, all who detest calumny and despise impostors, will hereafter be on their guard in the company of "P. Gordon;" and that, should they at any time iden-

tify the creature of the prostitute *Monk* and her infamous advisers, they will treat the wretch to a "pointed figure."

With an appearance of veracious detail she describes her first day at the convent; but even here it is easy to discern the fabrications of the "penny-a-liner." She enters the institution with "much satisfaction;" passes the morning with the novices, "expecting, with painful anxiety, the dinner hour!" We take this to be an obscure hint, that in the course of the morning her "satisfaction" became affected by serious apprehensions of her destination at the approaching meal; doubtful whether she was to be a guest or a dish. The poor girl, however, is not spitted; she is suffered to live, to eat her dinner in silence; to learn rules and ceremonies, to sit by windows, to mark the waywardness of a certain Jane Ray, of whom more hereafter; to listen to stories which make "a deep impression on her mind;" to comb the superior's head, and pick up "all the stray hairs;" to confess her sins, and be strangely questioned by the priests; to form shrewd guesses "of the confession-rooms" of the veiled nuns; to see gags, and see them used; to study French and Latin prayers, not for present use, but to prepare for the "easy repetition of them after she should be admitted as a nun;" and to regret that she had no opportunity of storing her mind, of polishing her manners, or of studying the higher branches of "Education!" Such are the plausible details of some ten or eleven pages of these "Awful Disclosures."

The first sentence of the next chapter exposes the foiled cunning of the association of impostors. She quits the convent "without obstacle," and gives

her reason in the following words. "After I had been a novice ~~four~~ or five years, that is, from the time that I ~~commenced~~ school at the convent, one day I was treated ~~by~~ one of the nuns in a manner which displeased me, and because I expressed some resentment, was required to beg her pardon. Not being satisfied with this, although I complied with the command, nor with the coolness with which the superior treated me, I determined to quit the convent at once, which I did without asking leave." There are two manifest falsehoods in this statement, which it is easy to discover by comparing it with what precedes. Is not the explanation of the time of her noviciate a deliberate lie? Let us see.—She commenced school at the Congregation, and remained there "about two years." These two years spent at school in one convent, she includes in the time of noviciate spent in another. Again, "after she left the Congregational Nunnery," she did not immediately become an inmate of the Hotel Dieu, but "attended several different schools," and lived at home. The interval of time, as has already been remarked, between her leaving one convent and joining another, is not mentioned; but whatever it was, whether great or small, it is included in the "four or five years" of noviciate at the Hotel Dieu. The reason assigned for leaving the latter institution is equally contradictory. It is incredible that a girl, whom the spectacle of horrible cruelty practised on the novices, the (to her) unsatisfactory routine of the cloisters, the "strange questions" of priests, could not induce to fly, should do so because required to beg pardon for an offence. Her "dissatisfaction" toward the superior, whom she was taught to regard, and whom she

states she actually did regard, as a "saint," is an obvious coinage of the penny-a-liner. "Soon after," we find her at St. Denis, engaged as an assistant teacher in a government school; a situation for which, it will be recollected, the instruction received by her at the age of six or seven years was her only qualification. While in this situation she discovers that "ciphering" is an improper expression, and that the bag of the superior's "stray hairs" cures the tooth-ache! She marries, separates from her husband, and finally resolves, without any imaginable inducement, to return to the convent of the Hotel Dieu. To effect her purpose, she persuades the "lady" with whom she had been associated as a teacher, to conceal her marriage, and disinterestedly lie for her to the superior of the convent and priests of the seminary. She robs her mother of thirty dollars, and by other robberies effected on several of her friends, she raises a number of pounds, part of which she deposits in the convent treasury. The superior, whom she regards as a "saint," and whose "stray hairs" she carries in a bag, receives "the money with evident satisfaction," knowing, of course, that it must have been dishonestly obtained!

As usual, this narrative, which it is pretended bears on it the stamp of truth, does not state what time elapsed between her leaving the Hotel Dieu and her return to it, or the date of the latter event! Have these omitted fabrications rendered the copyright more valuable to "P. Gordon" and his associates? Under the head of Specimen of "instructions received on the subject of confirmation," she relates stories of fire and brimstone, which "she was told;" and concludes her fifth chapter by the

following statement. "I was required to devote myself for about ~~the~~ year to the study of the prayers, and the practice ~~of~~ the ceremonies necessary on the reception of a nun." How does this agree with the previous statement, that such was the principal occupation of the novices from the commencement of their noviciate to the expiration of it? The statements are contradictory, and are each of them obviously false.

When her noviciate ceased, or how long it lasted, cannot in any manner be inferred from the narrative. Respecting the date of her becoming a professed nun, the narrative is equally silent. It is simply stated, that one day the "Bishop came," and made her one. On the same day she is graciously informed by the "saintly superior" of the existence of dungeons, and of victims therein confined; of the practices of priests, "which come on her like a flash of lightning," notwithstanding her previous experience acquired at confession, and derived from the stories of her "young companions;" and finally, of the pious practice of strangling infants for the purpose of securing their eternal happiness! A number of nuns are admitted to join in the conversation, whose representations affect, even to "indecision," the mind of the young nun on the obscure subject of the criminality of impudicity and blood-shedding. Forgetting, that from the very commencement of her intercourse with Catholics, her ears were saluted with debauchery and murder, she proceeds to say that there was "so much that disgusted her in the discovery she then made," that she would gladly have escaped, had it been in her power; but the obstacles in the way of flight, so easy to the novice, were suddenly

rendered almost invincible to the "nun," in what manner the reader is left to imagine. The "Disclosures" of the dinner ceremony of the reception day are not very horrible, but they help to fill a space. "Late in the afternoon" is stated to have been perpetrated the first crime of surpassing atrocity resting on the alleged personal cognizance of the witness Maria Monk. The "disclosure is reluctantly made, to expose the conduct of priests in our convent," and to gratify the imaginations of the people of the United States. Admitting these motives to be good, which they certainly are not, at least in a Christian sense, the most fanatical sectarian, or the most imaginative of dreamers, if possessed of a grain of honest sincerity, will not hesitate to acknowledge that the pretended exposure is a dastardly, but most fortunately a most stupid and easily detected calumny.

The seventh chapter, on "daily ceremonies," commences with singular pretension to accuracy. "On Thursday morning the bell rung at half-past six, to waken us." This "Thursday" stands alone. Was it a Thursday in 1820 or 1830? Who may tell from the narrative? The treatment she received "very late in the afternoon," and which is described at the close of the preceding chapter, appears to have cleared her mind of all "indecision," and brought it a state of calmness and impartiality befitting the keen observer and accurate memorialist. Accordingly we are favoured from page 64 with fifty-six pages of "Popish" legends—of conventual observances and conventual principles of morality. Chapter the eleventh describes a murder, which is agreeably refreshing. "The time was about five months after I took the veil; the weather was cool,

perhaps in September or October!" The recitals of mingled bloodshed, debauchery, and frivolity extended throughout the rest of the pamphlet, absurd as they manifestly are, will all be found answered in a subsequent chapter of this refutation.

We were at a loss to account for the expression, "an old woman for a nun, that is to say, about forty," applied to a nun at page 30, until we met with the following explanation at page 82. "It was a common remark always at the initiation of a new nun into the Black nun department, that is, to receive the black veil, that the introduction of another novice into the convent as a veiled nun always caused the introduction of a veiled nun into heaven as a saint, which was on account of the singular disappearance of some of the older nuns always at the entrance of new ones." The explanation, however, is not complete; for there is constant mention throughout the narrative of "old nuns," and the reader is induced to suppose that there is "always" a reasonable number of them; so that, even in the development of one of the main objects of the Disclosures, alleged murder and hints of murder, the authors of this libel are not consistent. We pause here to make a few obvious reflections suggested by the paragraph just quoted. It is to be inferred from the narrative, that the so called "Black nuns" live in a state of independence, and that their obedience to the priests is voluntary. They have their own buildings and their own grounds. The deeds done in the convent are "no secret," they are known to all, old and young, for all participate in them. Now, we are required to believe, that in a community thus constituted, the members have consented to surrender themselves to "singular dis-

appearances," or more plainly, to slaughter, when such sacrifice shall be exacted of them! We are required to credit that they waded their way through torrents of blood and sinks of hideous debauchery to their own premature graves: and this knowingly, and with the certainty of the fate which finally awaits them! There is no distinction of persons; the community is not represented as divided into despots and slaves, there is a perfect equality—all live in murder, and may expect to die by it. The superior herself does not escape the general lot; her "singular disappearance" is noticed at page 180. It is sickening to contemplate use of language at once so insulting to the understanding and disgusting to the imagination.

The escape of "Maria Monk" is a close imitation of the published erasion of the notorious "Miss Read." By her own account she was in frequent attendance on the visiting physician of the hospital, an eminent practitioner of the city, and a Protestant. Instead of communicating her desire to withdraw from the convent to that gentleman, who would not and could not have delayed for a moment its accomplishment, she prefers running a risk, a great risk—the risk of life itself. She is at "liberty;" but when, in what year or month, it is impossible to discover from the narrative.

We have shown that the narrative is glaringly deficient in verisimilitude, that it is marked at every step by revolting contradictions and absurdities, and that these may be perceived by the most prejudiced reader without the aid of *special* information. Special information, however, we have, and special information we shall produce, to the confusion of calumniators, and with the sincere

hope not that they may become objects of public execration, but that they may cease to be objects of public regard. Grant them compassion, but deny them countenance.

CHAPTER IV.

The source of some of the falsehoods contained in the "Awful Disclosures" pointed out.

To give the witness Monk some respectability of family, it is stated that her father "was an officer under the British government," and that her "mother has enjoyed a pension on that account ever since his death." The truth is, that her father was removed from a menial situation in a tavern at Quebec, and placed, by the interest of some officers, in the situation of barrack-master at St. John's. Her mother is a domestic employed at the governor's house in Montreal, and receives as wages two shillings per diem.

The falsehood that "Congregational nuns are established as instructresses in different parts of the United States," evidently originated in the desire to prejudice readers against Catholic teachers generally, by exciting among the ignorant the suspicion that they may be from Canada. Now, whether the nuns of Montreal are redeemed or not from obloquy by this refutation, we repeat, that none belonging to the foundation of the "Congregation," as mentioned in the "Disclosures," or to any other, are to be met with in the United States. Missions are sent from the convent of the Congregation to various parts of Canada; a convenient

stroke of the pen extends them in the "Disclosures" to the United States.

Careless readers may in some instances have been imposed upon by the appearance of detail which the "Disclosures" exhibit in describing the practices and discipline of Conventual life. A sufficient foundation for the construction of similar details exists in thousands of narratives and romances to be found in every language. The advisers of "Monk" would have been wise had they confined themselves to mere invention, and so much of compilation as could have been safely interwoven in the story. It was foolish in them to have used "Monk" for any other purpose than as the ostensible vehicle by which their slanders might be conveyed to the world. In what she has supplied, the manifest falsehood is so close to the probable truth, that the perception of the one instantly leads to the rejection of the other. Maria Monk has had some experience of a species of Conventual life gained by a residence of several months in an institution of the city of Montreal, commonly known as the Magdalen Asylum. The Asylum is under the control and direction of a charitable lady, who has for many years appropriated her revenues and devoted her whole time to the wretched and sinful of her sex. This lady, Mrs. McDonell, received "Maria Monk" into her establishment, and endeavoured, by every means in her power, to restore her to habits of virtue; but Monk proved a hardened sinner, and the efforts of her benevolent instructress were ultimately unsuccessful. Monk left the Asylum, and for several months wandered about from place to place as the pretended wife of a disgraced and cast-off clergyman. To this man, who knew

her real character, and how abandoned it was, she communicated the history of her residence at Mrs. McDonell's, and his love of lucre immediately suggested the use which might be made of it. Such is the real origin of the "Awful Disclosures."

Mrs. McDonell is a devout woman, and she has adopted in the Asylum, for the purposes of order and religion, many of the practices of Conventual life. She has remarked to the writer, that the portion of the "Disclosures" relating to Conventual discipline is entirely borrowed from the habits to which "Monk" was subjected while an inmate of the Asylum. It is not that the truth is told, but there is not a line which may not be accounted for. Thus, at page 21, where mention is made of fifty girls at the Congregational school, the fabrication will be accounted for by stating, that there were fifty girls at the Asylum at the time "Monk" entered it. At the Asylum also, Holy water is placed at the doors of the apartments, and the girls are expected to use it. The entrance or way to the school-room of the boarders at the Congregation it was out of Monk's power to have described, for she never was a boarder at the convent, and never was admitted within the building. Monk, at the age of nine years, and about the year 1826, attended the poor-school of the Congregation for a few months : but the poor-school-room is entirely separate from the convent proper, and the entrance to it is immediately from the yard. There is no "long covered passage"—no "turn to the left;" but there are "covered passages and turns" in the building of the Magdalen Asylum.

At page 22, the Conventual establishments of Montreal are named, as,

First—The “Congregational Nunnery.”

Second—The “Black Nunnery” or Convent of Sister “Bourgeoise.”

Third—The “Grey Nunnery.”

The proper appellations of the convents are not here “disclosed,” nor are they used in any part of the pamphlet. The ability of the pretended ex-nun to name or describe things as they really are, does not show itself commensurate with the necessity of doing so in order to give an appearance of truth to her “disclosures.” The correct names of the convents are—

First—“Congregation de Notre Dame.”

Second—“Hotel Dieu.”

Third—“Hospital General.”

It will be perceived that the “Hotel Dieu” corresponds with the “Black Nunnery, or Convent of Sister Bourgeoise.” The foundation for this description is, that one of the three nunneries is sometimes called by the English population the “Black Nunnery,” and that there lived, in the seventeenth century, a pious lady, who went by the name of Sister Borgeois. The errors are three in number; the nunnery sometimes called the “Black Nunnery,” is not the “Hotel Dieu,” but the “Congregational Nunnery;” “Sister Bourgeoise” is improperly written for “Sister Bourgeois;” and lastly, the name of the pious sister is associated with an institution in the foundation of which she was nowise concerned, and which, indeed, originated before her arrival in Canada. These errors are, we grant, not important in themselves, but unpardonable in the alleged production of an ex-nun of the “Hotel Dieu,” and point out clearly the manner in which the “Disclosures” have been got up.

It is stated that the charities of the "Hotel Dieu" are but insignificant when compared "with the size of the buildings." The origin of this error must be looked for solely in the ignorance and malignity of the prompters of the pretended witness. The falsehood is easily answered. The Hotel Dieu consists of five parts, nearly equal in size; of these, three are exclusively devoted to public charity, and the remaining two consist partly of cloisters, and partly of apartments where articles for the poor and destitute are prepared.

It is stated that the nuns of the Hotel Dieu and General Hospital have their "common names (black and grey) from the colours of the dresses worn by their inmates." The reason assigned is not sufficient to account for the aforesaid "common names," inasmuch as the nuns of the Congregation also wear the black habit. The truth is, that the nuns of the Congregation and the nuns of the General Hospital have establishments out of the city, which is not the case with the nuns of the Hotel Dieu; and in the neighbourhood of those establishments they are sometimes distinguished as "black and grey nuns." It may still further be observed, that the nuns of the Hotel Dieu never leave the precincts of their convent; whereas, both the nuns of the Congregation and of the General Hospital may frequently be seen in the streets, and the citizens are thus led to distinguish them by the colour of their dresses.

It is stated at page 23, that "in all" large quantities of various ornaments are made by the nuns, which are exposed for sale in the *ornament* rooms, and afford large pecuniary receipts every year, which contribute much to their incomes. In these

rooms, visitors often purchase such things as please them from some of the old confidential nuns who have the charge of them. At the Magdalen Asylum there is a room in which ornamental and other articles made by the girls are exhibited to visitors. The "confidential nuns" at the Asylum, are girls in whom Mrs. McDonell is induced to place confidence from having observed their advancement in morality. It is true, that at one time articles of fancy were made at the convents, but those articles were produced for sale in the sick wards, and the products expended in procuring additional comforts for the sick and infirm. The sale was confined to strangers, and, as may readily be imagined, was trifling. The custom is now dropped, and the nuns have sacrificed their "large pecuniary receipts" to the more important objects of peace and freedom from impertinence.

It is stated at page 30, that among the nuns of the Congregation there is a certain Saint Patrick, "an old woman for a nun" (that is, about forty) with quite a beard." The only truth in this is, that Saint Patrick is the Conventual name of one of the sisterhood; the talent of the witness has expanded it into a falsehood. Saint Patrick is now (1836) in her twenty-seventh year; and unfortunately for the description, has as yet betrayed no appearance of a "beard."

As we have no means of ascertaining the date of Monk's vision of the "age" and "beard" of Saint Patrick, we cannot fix upon her age at the time her appearance on the stage of horrors is "disclosed." Monk, it is stated, was at school when Saint Patrick was "an old woman for a nun;" but was this five or ten years ago, no reader of the "Disclosures"

may say. In the meantime the "old woman" is now in her *twenty-seventh year!*

At page 30 it is stated that the pupils "were allowed to enter only a few of the rooms in the Congregational nunnery, although it was not considered one of the secluded convents." A "secluded convent" is one which the inmates never leave, and there is only one of the kind in Montreal, although the authors of the "Disclosures," with their usual disregard of accuracy, intimate that there are several. Monk's acquaintance with a "secluded convent" was formed at the Asylum. The "veiled nuns," so mysteriously mentioned throughout the "Disclosures," are nothing more than "nuns." All nuns wear veils. The nuns of the three convents at Montreal never wear their veils over the face. The poor of the city are as familiar with their countenances as they are with their good deeds.

It is stated (page 34) that Monk, on the day she commenced her noviciate, was introduced among about "forty novices." There are *novices* at the Hotel Dieu; so much for the truth; but Monk has expanded three or four (there are seldom more, and more frequently less) into the enormous number of "forty." With a supply of forty novices, and an annual creation of forty nuns, or even twenty, the five parts of the Hotel Dieu would speedily become insufficient for the accommodation of the sisterhood. The superior informed the vast assemblage, "that a new novice had come, and she desired any present, who might have known her in the world, to signify it." Novices are taken from the class of "postulantes," and not immediately from the "World;" and the alleged inquiry is

one generally made at the Magdalen Asylum. There the girls are forbidden to converse on the events of their past lives, and obedience in this particular is specially enjoined on those who may have been acquaintances before entering the Asylum. "Two Miss Fougneés, and a Miss Howard from Vermont, who had been my fellow-pupils in the Congregational nunnery, immediately recognized me." Were we dealing with a bold and able impostor, whose pen "disclosed" recitals contrived with skill and sustained by ingenious allegations, the task of refutation might be difficult, and even with some, smitten with the attraction of details of Conventual debauchery, ineffectual; but we are spared the pain of contemplating possible failure wherever this reply is read. Much as the band of fanatics who have ushered the "Awful Disclosures" into the world under the sanction of religion, have committed themselves in other particulars, it is in our power to give to their infamy a still deeper dye. They must have been rendered insane by the instigations of their own malice, or they would never have ventured to adduce real personages in support of the "Disclosures." They have, however, actually done so, and their enormous fabrication concerning the individuals mentioned in the passage just quoted would, in itself, be sufficient to prove the falsehood of the whole narrative. We shall commence by admitting, as the foundation of the falsehood of the pretended novice, that there are three persons living, whose names resemble those given in the "Disclosures," and that Monk was personally known to them. The falsehoods are startling. Neither "Miss Howard" nor the two "Miss Fougneés" were at any time fellow-pupils of Monk

at the Congregation; two of the three have not at any time been inmates of the Hotel Dieu, either as novices or otherwise, nor have they any knowledge or information of Monk's stay there, except from her published narrative. The acquaintance of Monk with Miss Fournier (not "Fougnee") and her sister commenced and ended at the Magdalen Asylum, where those two young persons were engaged as assistants to Mrs. McDonell.* "Miss Howard from Vermont" knew nothing of Monk previously to the entrance of the latter into the Asylum. She never has been within the walls of a convent, and during several months of hourly intercourse with Monk, never heard the latter pretend that she had been at any period of her life an inmate of a convent. We have deemed it right to procure documentary evidence on these points, which shall be produced in its proper place. We had forgotten to state that her alleged application to Father Rocque, mentioned at the commencement of the third chapter, is a positive invention. We know from Father Rocque that he has never seen or conversed with Maria Monk. The miserable beings who vouch for this woman's veracity, may indeed reject the testimony of a venerable old man because he happens to be a "popish priest," but independently of it, her account contains some notorious untruths. It is stated that "Father Rocque" succeeded "Father Roue" as superior of the seminary, and was superior at the time of her application. These statements are untrue. Mr. Quiblier succeeded "Father Roux," not *Roue*, as su-

*The elder Miss Fournier had been a novice at the Hotel Dieu, but never took the vows. Monk's acquaintance with this fact enabled her to add to her vocabulary the word "novice."

perior of the seminary. The time of Monk's pretended application to Mr. Rocque is, as usual, not mentioned, but we can say that that clergyman never has been at any time superior of the seminary.

The information of Monk on the seminary itself is such as might be expected from a woman of her class. "It is the general rendezvous and centre of all the priests in the district of Montreal, and, I have been told, supplies all the country with priests as far down as Three Rivers, which place is, I believe, under the charge of the seminary of Quebec. About one hundred and fifty priests are connected with that of Montreal, as every small place has one priest, and a number of larger ones have two." The untruths are nearly as numerous as the words. The seminary is not a "general rendezvous;" it does not supply the district with priests. The seminary is a corporation, enjoying the ministration of the parish of Montreal, and has only one mission, to the lake of Two Mountains. The number of priests connected with the seminary is not one hundred and fifty, either for the reason assigned in the "Disclosures?" or for any other. The number of priests connected with the seminary seldom exceeds thirty. We need not say, that on all these points nuns are well informed. At page 34, we find in the mention of "Saint Clotilde," a falsehood, which is repeated time over time throughout the pamphlet. Let it be remembered that it is an ex-nun of the Hotel Dieu who speaks, and let it be remarked that she every where speaks of her companions in that hospital and convent as being distinguished by the names of saints taken from the Catholic calendar. Each instance is a falsehood, and we here place be-

fore the reader the origin of it. The nuns of the Congregation generally assume the names of saints, and also at the Hotel Dieu the names of saints are placed distinct to the eye over the beds of the patients. On this foundation some gentleman in black, with elongated visage and sanctimonious air, visiting the latter institution in search of sin under the coverlids of disease, has raised the fancied superstructure which it is now our business to destroy. With two exceptions, there are no "Saints" at the Hotel Dieu, and the nuns are collectively named as "Sœurs St. Joseph," or sisters of St. Joseph, and individually after their baptismal and family appellations. It is customary for two of the sisters to assume the names of St. Joseph and St. Augustin, the patron saints of the convent. The sister who bore the name of Saint Joseph, died about three years since; and at the present time there is only one sister who is distinguished by a saint's name. Had Maria Monk been at any time a nun at the Hotel Dieu, she would have been known as "Sister Maria Monk," or, more briefly, as "Sister Monk." "Clotilde" is the name of the younger Miss Fournier, and it was usual at the Magdalen Asylum to style her "St. Clotilde."

At pages 36 and 37, a girl named Jane McCoy, and an "old nun" named Jane Ray, are mentioned for the first time. Perfect madness! These two women are reformed prostitutes, and were inmates of the Magdalen Asylum contemporaneously with Maria Monk. Our remarks on the unparalleled impudence and imbecility of the advisers of Monk in bringing forward the names of real persons to substantiate the "Disclosures," apply here with peculiar force. We have taken the trouble to count

the pages of the "Disclosures" occupied with the sayings and doings of this "Jane Ray," and we find them to amount in number to forty-six. Forty-six pages of falsehood so easily refuted! Forty-six pages of falsehood met by the incontestable facts that Jane Ray never was an inmate of the Hotel Dieu; that Jane Ray is a reformed prostitute, that she has been for years living at the Magdalen Asylum, and that her sole acquaintance with Monk was formed during the stay of the latter at the Asylum! We freely confess that it is more easy to admit scandal than to extirpate it after it has been received; but we put it to the consciences of the most simple-minded, if, after this exposure of the origin of the "Disclosures," they can retain for them a particle of credulity.

The falsehoods concerning Monk's re-admission to the noviciate, mentioned at page 47, are so interwoven in the narrative, that it is difficult to separate them. In fact, every word is a lie. We shall endeavour to enumerate the more flagrant of them. It will be seen by referring to the narrative, that she states that "money is usually required for the admission of novices;" that she paid money for her re-admission; and that she robbed her mother of thirty dollars, by applying for her pension to the brigade Major. The only foundation for these lies is, that nuns, before taking the veil, are required, by a law that cannot be suspended or put aside, to pay into the treasury of the convent, for charitable purposes, the sum of three thousand francs, or about five hundred and sixty dollars. The reader will look in vain for any evidence, for any pretence, that such sum was paid by Monk. As we have before observed, the mother of Monk is in the receipt of

wages, not of a "pension" properly so called; and we now add that such pension, if enjoyed, could not have been received by the daughter nor paid by a brigade major. The law regulates such matters differently; moreover there is no such officer as brigade major stationed at Montreal. The origin of this lie is easily traced. Until recently, the town major of Montreal had the use and occupation of the government house where Monk's mother was employed as a domestic. This was the case when Monk and her paramour, the repudiated clergyman, were in Montreal. We cannot hope to disturb any honest man's belief that such vile creatures as Maria Monk and her crew may have robbed and stolen; but we think that reformed sinners, whether hatched in the purlieus of vice and sensuality, or in the conventicles of bastard sectarianism, should give to their self-condemnations at least the appearance of truth.

At page 48 it is stated, that "one of her cousins from Lachine, named Reed, spent about a fortnight with her," and that the "bold young novice" was dismissed for indecorous language. The only foundation for these falsehoods is, that there is a girl named "Reed" with whom Monk was acquainted; but Reed never was an inmate of the Hotel Dieu. Reed was an inmate of the Magdalen Asylum contemporaneously with Maria Monk. Independently of this, the lie is awkwardly composed. It is first stated that she is a visitor, and a few lines lower down she is transformed into a novice. The parts of the lie are badly adjusted. The inventors of these noviciates knew not of the class of *postulantes*, from which all novices must be taken. Reed is unceremoniously made a novice, in a manner which itself betrays the falsehood of the narrative.

It is contrary to the rules and practice of the Hotel Dieu Hospital and Convent to give admission into any of the three classes into which its inmates are divided, unless the applicant have previously received the sacrament of confirmation. If this is true respecting the lowest class, that of *postulantes*, it is so *a fortiori* of the class of novices, of which Monk states she was a member at the time she was confirmed. The only foundation that appears to exist for Monk's descriptions of her participation in Catholic ceremonies and Catholic observances, is, that at some periods of her hypocritical life she put on the guise of a member of the Roman Catholic church, and in that guise became acquainted with some of its rites. We presume that it will not be disputed, that, even if all other points be neglected or passed over, the Catholicism at least of girls received into an establishment such as the Hotel Dieu, must be undoubted. There is not the slightest reason to believe, either from the narrative or from any other source, that Monk could have proved, or that she undertook to prove, her conversion to the Roman Catholic faith. By the canons of the church, which are strictly observed in Canada, a convert to Catholicism is required to submit to two acts, namely, of conditional baptism and of abjuration, and those acts are regularly registered at the places where they are made. In the case of Monk, it is not "disclosed" in what year or by whom she was instructed in the Roman Catholic faith—at what place or into whose hands she made her abjuration—or who were the witnesses of it; by whom, on what day, or at what place, she received baptism, under condition, agreeably to the rites of the Roman Catholic church. On all these points the

narrative is silent. The deficiency cannot be supplied without further fabrication, which we should think this exposure will deter the boldest of Monk's advisers from resorting to.

Before dismissing the subject of Monk's pretended confirmation, we shall make two quotations concerning it from the "Disclosures." She states, that "on the day she went to the church to be confirmed, her conscience troubled her!" She then describes the ceremony after her fashion, and concludes by saying, that "she went home with qualms of conscience." Maria Monk's conscience! We infer from the language of the narrative, that she went from the Hotel Dieu to a church to be confirmed; or, in other words, that the ceremony was not performed at the chapel of the convent; and also, that after the ceremony she returned to her mother's house (see page 31), where the word "home" is expressly used in this sense, which, indeed, is the most obvious and proper. Now, it will be recollected that the nuns, novices, and *postulantes* of the Hotel Dieu, never leave the precincts of the Hospital and Convent for any purpose whatsoever. Thus the story of Monk's pretended confirmation is falsehood running into falsehood, and so clumsily constructed, that in whatever light it be viewed, it presents still the same ugly aspect of forgery.

We are informed by Mrs. McDonell, that Monk "disclosed" to her a story of confirmation in language resembling that used in the narrative, but of course never dared to pretend that she was a novice, either at the time of such confirmation or at any other. She declared to Mrs. McDonell that she was confirmed at St. Denis, in the church there administered by Mr. Bedard. She also mentioned

that she had concealed some sin from Mr. Bedard at confession, which excited in her the "qualms of conscience."

The ceremony of taking the veil is "disclosed" with much circumstance and detail. It is in our power to say, that not Monk nor any one else has ever acted a part in such a scene as is described by her in the sixth chapter of the "Disclosures." The origin of the falsehoods must be looked for in the information of the parties to them. That there is a ceremony performed at the taking of the veil, this alone is true; all else is positively and notoriously false. We shall quote from the "Disclosures" only two passages concerning this pretended ceremony. At page 53 it is stated, "taking the veil is an affair which occurs so frequently in Montreal, that it has long ceased to be regarded as a novelty; and although notice had been given in the French parish church as usual, only a small audience have assembled, as I have mentioned."

Were Monk's assertion made at page 34, that she was introduced among forty novices, founded in truth, it might readily be inferred, that "taking the veil is an affair which occurs frequently at Montreal." The concordance between the two statements presents one of the very few instances of consistency to be met with in the course of the narrative. The truth however is, as we have before remarked, that the nuns of the Hotel Dieu Hospital and convent are few in number, and that the novices seldom exceed three or four. We now add, that the nuns of the Hotel Dieu and the nuns of the Congregation in Montreal are the only nuns who go through the ceremony of taking the veil in public; and that the ceremony is regarded by the citi-

zens as a great novelty, and is always numerously attended. The second member of the sentence states that notice of the ceremony is usually given in the "French parish church." Not only is it false that such notice is "usually given," but in fact it is never given, and most certainly was not given on the occasion of Monk's pretended reception. Of the thousands who frequent the parish church, not one will be found to say that the name of "Maria Monk" has ever been sounded from the pulpit of that building.

At page 54 we find the following "disclosure;" "After taking the vows, I proceeded to a small apartment behind the altar, accompanied by four nuns, where was a coffin prepared with my nun name engraven upon it,"

"SAINT EUSTACE."

"My companions lifted it by four handles attached to it, while I threw off my dress and put on that of a nun of Sœur (sister) Bourgeoise" (again incorrecly written for "Bourgeois.")

Is it necessary to say that there is no such coffin? Will the reader please to observe that "the disclosure" just quoted conveys two assertions resting on the personal evidence of the woman Monk; namely, that the "nun name" of "Saint Eustace" was bestowed on her at her reception, and that on the same occasion she put on the habit of "Sister Bourgeoise;" and will he then turn to our previous remarks on these two points? He will instantly see that it was impossible for the pretended ex-nun to have assumed or received the "nun name" of "Saint Eustace," for such names never have been assumed by the nuns of the Hotel Dieu Hospital and convent, with the exceptions al-

ready mentioned; and he will also see, that the "putting on the dress of Sister Bourgeoise" was equally impossible to the pretended ex-nun, inasmuch as Sister Bourgeois, (not Bourgeoise,) of pious memory, belonged to another and entirely distinct institution, of which she was the founder; that she was in no manner connected with the Hotel Dieu; and that the nuns of the latter foundation are sisters of St. Joseph. The reader may then ponder at will on the authenticity and verisimilitude of the artless "Disclosures" of the pretended ex-nun. We must state here, that the laws of the province of Canada regulate the acceptance of the religious habit and interfere therein. By those laws it is required that an instrument shall be drawn up and executed, wherein the voluntary co-operation of the new nun shall be set forth, together with other ceremonies appertaining to her reception. The deed must be signed by a notary and competent witnesses. Need we say that no such deed concerning Monk is in existence?

At page 61, the falsehood concerning her "new name" is repeated. She found it inscribed on a certain "band" at the dinner table. The pretended details of conventual life given at this part of the narrative, are all borrowed from Monk's experience gained at the Magdalen Asylum. There the dinner hour, for instance, is eleven; and a band or ticket, with the "owner's name" marked on it, "is fastened to the napkin." The napkin of the pretended ex-nun bore the inscription of "Maria Monk."

Father Dufresne, mentioned at page 62 in a way that marks the atrocious intentions of the advisers of "Monk," is a clergyman, justly venerated for his benevolence and indefatigable exertions in the

duties of his calling. He has been for years the friend of Mrs. McDonell, and has advised and assisted that lady in the conduct of the Magdalen Asylum from its commencement. At the Asylum he once spoke with Maria Monk, an occurrence which minds prolific of calumny have expanded into a disgusting outrage.

The "daily ceremonies" described in the seventh chapter of the "Disclosures," are taken from Monk's remembrance of what she saw practised at the Asylum. Her reminiscences are, however, more frequently inaccurate than otherwise. The words in French are used at the Asylum; the prayers spoken of are said there. There is also a community room in which the nuns are daily assembled; but reformed "popish priests" may be able to certify, that in convents there is only one apartment styled a "Community room." It takes its name from the use made of it, and is called in French "chambre de la communauté," or "room of the community." Monk's narrative creates for the Hotel Dieu dozens of such apartments. The error of the pretended ex-nun is foolish and unnecessary for the purposes of the "Disclosures."

"BENISSANTE," prominently printed at page 68, is an amusing transformation of the two first words of a well-known catholic hymn, "Veni Sancte;" this hymn is daily sung at the Asylum.

What follows is extracted from page 81 of the "Disclosures," and affords a pretty specimen of the consistency of the penny-a-liners. "The Congregational Nunnery was founded by a nun called sister Bourgeoise. She taught a school in Montreal, and left property for the foundation of a convent. Her body is buried, and her heart is kept under the

nunnery in an iron chest, which has been shown to me, with the assurance that it continues in perfect preservation, although she has been dead more than one hundred and fifty years. In the chapel is the following inscription: 'Sœur Bourgeoise, Fondatrice du Couvent,'—'Sister Bourgeoise, Founder of the Convent.'" The only truth in this piece of tattle is, that the Congregational nunnery was founded by a sister Bourgeois (not Bourgeoise.) The passage makes a strange appearance in the "Awful Disclosures," for it has no connection with what immediately precedes or succeeds. It would seem to have been inserted by some malicious spirit, for the purpose of bringing the authors to utter confusion. As it is, compare the admission there made, that the Congregational nunnery was founded by sister Bourgeoise, (Bourgeois,) with two statements which we have already noticed. At page 22 the Hotel Dieu is designated as the convent of sister "Bourgeoise," (Bourgeois,) and at page 54 the nuns of the Hotel Dieu are designated as the nuns of "Sister Bourgeois!" Further comment on this point is unnecessary. The pretended ex-nun has the "assurance" to say, that she was shown "an iron chest under the nunnery, in which the body of the sister is buried and her heart is kept." Monk was never shown such "chest," for none such exists. Even the mere and simple laity of Montreal know better than this pretended ex-nun how the remains of sister Bourgeois were disposed of. The following is a translation of the only inscription which exists concerning the sister Bourgeois. The inscription itself may be read in the conventual chapel, which is not "under the nunnery," but beside it.

"Here, in this small leaden chest, is inclosed a

silver box in the form of a heart, which contains the remains of that of the venerable sister, Margaret Bourgeois, instructress of the community of the Congregation of our Lady in Canada, deceased the 12th January, 1700. Her body had at first been interred in the chapel belonging to the sisters in the parish of Montreal, from which place her bones have been transferred into this church in 1766. They repose in the sanctuary, interred against the wall on the left side of the altar. Her heart, a year after her death, had been solemnly deposited in this chapel, and subsequently, having been in part spared by the flames of the fire of 1768, was there replaced the 30th June, 1782."

Monk was at the poor school of the congregation in her ninth year; and her "disclosure" regarding the sister Bourgeois is an imperfect reminiscence of that early age.

At page 89 and elsewhere, nuns are mentioned as employed in saying their "catechism." The untruth is obvious, for it may readily be inferred that nuns who undergo years of religious training as novices and *postulantes*, have no occasion to repeat the "catechism" after their reception. At the Asylum the girls are taught the catechism, and the practice there followed has supplied Monk with a reminiscence for the coinage of her untruth.

The falsehood concerning "nun names" is elaborately repeated at page 91. "I found that I had several namesakes among the nuns, for there were two others who had already bore away my new name, saint Eustace. This was not a solitary case, for there were five saint Marys and three saint Monros, besides two novices of that name." We are here informed, for the first time, that even

novices assume the names of "saints," and though not yet "nuns," nevertheless bear these pretended "nun names." These idle fabrications destroy each other. It is previously stated that these "nun names" are conferred on the day the ceremony of taking the veil is performed. It is stated that the "new name" of the new nun "is found inscribed on her coffin!"

We can account for the fabrication of the pretended "squaw nuns," mentioned in the ninth chapter of the "Disclosures." At the Asylum there was, contemporaneously with Monk, an Indian girl, the grand-daughter of Thomas Raco Suinte, a chief of the "Sault St. Louis." But Indians have not large sums of money to pay for the "admission of their daughters into convents." The money paid on the admission of a nun is not measured by weight. The Indians in Lower Canada live in communities, and are not allowed by law to "sell their property." The idea of the pretended squaw nun, "St. Hypolite," originated in the circumstance of the elder Miss Fournier owning that name.

The story of the "secret bell," mentioned at page 97, is another reminiscence of the Magdalen Asylum. The buildings at the Asylum are situate in a yard, which separates them from the lane leading to the gate. The gate itself is provided with a moveable board, by means of which, a person inside can ascertain before opening who the applicant for admission is. Outside the gate is a "bell handle," which is not "entirely concealed." So much for the origin of the fable of the "secret bell."

Monk was at St. Denis in the year 1833 and 1834, and there may have seen or heard of the Rev. Mr. Bird, vicar to the Rev. J. Baptiste Bedard, curate

of the parish. She introduces him at page 98, with his name transformed into "Bierze."

The names of the books mentioned at page 98, are another reminiscence of the Asylum, where those books are actually used. Some two or three, however, of those mentioned have no existence. The "Examen de Conscience" is the title of a chapter in most Catholic prayer-books, and to which the attention of Monk was frequently directed by Mrs. McDonell, but there is no *book* of the name.

At the commencement of the tenth chapter it is stated, that the manufacture of wax was an important branch of business in the nunnery, and that "it was carried on in a small room, on the first floor, thence called the *ciergerie*, or wax-room, *cierge* being the French word for *wax*." Monk would have us believe that she "was sometimes sent to read to the nuns employed there." At the Asylum the manufacture of wax tapers is a "branch of business," and the room in which the manufacture is carried on is certainly called the *ciergerie*, though not for the reason mentioned in the "Disclosures," as *cierge* is not "the French word for wax." Monk was occasionally sent to read "there" to the girls, while at work. At page 109, Monk has appropriated to herself the interesting title of the "devout English reader," of Jane Ray's invention; but "Jane Ray," with whom we have conversed, denies that she had any knowledge of it.

The needle of Monk was sometimes employed at the Asylum in making scapularies. She describes them in the "Disclosures" as having on one side a kind of double cross, and on the other I. H. S., the meaning of which she "does not exactly know."

This is not surprising in a prostitute, but nuns are better informed.

The "Disclosures" make Messrs. Bonin, Richards, and Sauvage, together with the Bishop, authors of, and witness to the death of "St. Francis." Mr. Bonin succeeded Mr. Dufresne as religious adviser to Mrs. McDonell, and in that capacity was personally known to Monk. Neither Mr. Bonin nor Messrs. Richards and Sauvage, have at any time been chaplains to the Hotel Dieu. The Bishop and Mr. Sauvage have the years of the Roman Cenci, but are not reputed to resemble him in other particulars.

Mr. Quiblier, superior of the Montreal seminary, mentioned at page 150 and elsewhere, is a gentleman of the highest character; and yet we are induced to believe, that in some places, and with some people, the word of such a man may be of less weight than that of the thief and prostitute. To believe in Mr. Quiblier's visits to the Hotel Dieu, it is necessary to introduce the machinery of the "subterranean passage." As Mr. Quiblier never has been chaplain to the Hotel Dieu, they could not have been otherwise paid. The belief in the "subterranean passage" is comfortable, for it solves many difficulties. We shall doubtless distress many a fool by depriving him of it.

At page 153 it is stated, that the youngest novice who ever took the veil "was only fourteen years of age." This is an implied falsehood. By the laws of Canada, no nun can "take the veil" before she has attained the age of sixteen.

Will Monk's story, related at page 154, induce any one to believe, that a Catholic bishop and vicar general of the diocese of Quebec may be found on

“public squares” on the days of executions! We regard it as a singular instance of timidity, that the authors of the “Disclosures” have not invented for the region of Canada an “*Auto da fe*,” under the superintendence of the bishop and his clergy.

Visits of the bishop to the Hotel Dieu, and his participation in the crimes alleged to be committed there, are repeatedly charged in the “Disclosures.” Now, when the bishop visits the convent proper, he is always dressed in his canonical robes, and is attended by at least two of his clergy. Such visits are in their nature public, and could not be otherwise paid without exciting public remark. The name of the bishop is not well known to the ex-nun, for it is written in three or four different ways throughout the narrative.

The story of the “Saint Bon Pasteur,” introduced at page 160, is not only evidently absurd, but is also a singular instance of the mode in which the fabrications of the “Disclosures” have originated. “Bon Pasteur,” or the “Good Shepherd,” is an expression habitually used by devout Christians in speaking of our Saviour. This expression was frequently introduced in the prayers daily recited at the Asylum, and such is the pure and simple origin of the fable of the “Bon Pasteur.” In conversing with Mrs. McDonell, she satisfied us fully on this point. In fact, there is not perhaps a single lie told in the “Disclosures,” for which a similar origin might not be found. Thus the “songs” which are interspersed throughout the “Disclosures,” are catches which were familiar to the girls of the Asylum.

A most atrocious charge is brought, at page 169, against the whole body of priests. The mind sickens in the contemplation of such horrible

calumny. Our indignation against the abettors of Monk in her scheme of infamy, and the villany we impute to them, are more than justified. It will be better to lay aside all false delicacy, and give the charge at once in the proper words of the narrative. "The priests are liable, by their dissolute habits, to occasional attacks of disease, which render it necessary, or at least prudent, to submit to medical treatment." We put it to the common sense of the reader, if these "occasional attacks of disease" do not suppose habits of promiscuous debauchery in common receptacles of sensuality; but, with such habits, could the priests by any possible precaution escape the stigma of public opinion? Certainly not. Now the priests of Montreal and of Canada do enjoy at least public esteem for morality, and, if necessary, the testimony of every adult in the province would be gladly yielded to their excellent character. Opposed to this character, and its absolute incompatibility with the charge, we have the evidence of Monk delivered in the following terms. "I am able to speak from personal knowledge, for I have been a nun of Sœur Bourgeoise." A nun of Sœur Bourgeoise (Bourgeois) means, if any thing, a nun of the Congregation; a nun of the Hôtel Dieu is a "Sœur de St. Joseph;" but this signal contradiction, which we have pointed out more than once before, was not necessary to cover the calumniators with confusion. We have it in our power to show that it was in common brothels that the wretched woman Monk made herself familiar with "occasional attacks of disease;" and that it was among women of her class, at a time she alleges she was an inmate of the Hôtel Dieu, she learned the dis-

inction between prudence and necessity in submitting to medical treatment.

Monk became acquainted with the name of "Father Tombeau" from the circumstance of a revered clergyman, bearing a name somewhat similar, having died about the time Monk left the Magdalen Asylum. The funeral ceremony excited much attention at the time, as the deceased was widely known and respected. Notwithstanding the charge made in the "Disclosures" of Maria Monk, the charitable and Christian reader may believe that the soul of the good clergyman and faithful pastor "rests in peace."

"Father Larkin," mentioned at page 174, has been for years past a professor at the Montreal college. His brother, a sub-deacon, is also employed there. Will it be credited, that a gentleman so employed could by any possibility be "on duty" of any description at the Hotel Dieu Hospital and Convent?

There is as little truth in the description given at page 177 of the obsequies of a nun, as in that of the ceremony of taking the veil. It is stated that "when a Black nun is dead, the corpse is dressed as if living, and placed in the chapel in a sitting posture within the railing round the altar, with a book in the hand as if reading." A "Black nun," or nun of the foundation of sister Bourgeois, is not a nun of the Hotel Dieu Hospital and Convent; and when a nun of the latter institution dies, she is not exhibited "with a book in the hand." The exhibition is public, and the information obtained by the repudiated minister who accompanied Monk from New-York to Montreal, has been awkwardly and incorrectly transferred to the pages of the "Awful

Disclosures." The vows of a nun of the Hotel Dieu, taken with the veil, are always written out; retained about her person as long as she lives; and placed in her hand when laid out in the chapel of the convent. Are the authors of the "Disclosures" prepared to say what those vows are, or what have become of the recorded vows taken by their witness? A ring is placed on the finger of a nun of the Hotel Dieu at the time of her reception. That ring is never removed, and is buried with her. Are the authors of the "Disclosures" prepared to describe that ring with the inscription thereon? Can they account for the silence observed on these points by their witness? Can they inform their dupes what has become of the ring which their witness must have received and worn, if their allegations concerning her nunship are founded in truth?

By referring to the "Disclosures," page 178, it will be seen that it is stated that the superior of the Hotel Dieu was in the habit of absenting herself from the convent, and that it is intimated that on such occasion she would visit the priest's farm, situate at some distance from the city. The manifest falsehood of this "disclosure" will be at once perceived, when it is recollected that the vows of the nuns of the Hotel Dieu bind them to perpetual seclusion within the precincts of the hospital and convent; and that the existence of those vows is known to the citizens. No nun is ever seen out of the convent; no nun would dare brave the exposure. It is not even pretended that either the visits to the farm, or the visits to the Congregational Nunnery, mentioned at page 25, were secret!

Although Monk styles the disappearance of the

“old superior” one of the “most remarkable and unaccountable things that happened in the convent,” it is nevertheless accounted for at the very page that follows, by insinuating that she was murdered; an occurrence that need not have appeared at all remarkable to Maria Monk. This has been elsewhere noticed: we shall now state how superiors of the Hotel Dieu do sometimes disappear.

At the expiration of every three years a conventual chapel is held for the purpose of electing a new superior. By the rules of the foundation, the same person cannot be elected more than twice in succession, and consequently, at least every six years the “old superior disappears,” and a new superior takes her place. The disappearance is, however, not total; for the “old superior” merges into the community, of which she remains a member for life, unless re-elected at a subsequent period. The election is always certified by a formal instrument, as required by law. The installing of a new superior is somewhat differently described in the “disclosures.” There it is stated, that “one morning” the nuns, on their arrival in the community room, found the Bishop, but “no superior;” strange to say, the Bishop addresses the nuns “instead of the superior, who was nowhere to be seen.” He then introduces to them one of the oldest nuns, Saint Du, “as their superior.” This cloud of nonsense, falsehood, and foolish mysteriousness, (*Saint Du!*) may be dispersed in a very few words. There have been two superiors since 1821, and both are still living at the Hotel Dieu. The present superior was in office from 1821 to 1827, and was re-elected in 1833, and again in 1836.

We quote the following passage from page 190.

“One of the most shocking stories I heard of the events that had occurred in the nunnery before my acquaintance with it, was the following, which was told me by Jane. What is uncommon, I can fix the date when I heard it; it was on New Year’s day, 1834.” Uncommon, indeed! for it is the only date mentioned throughout the “Disclosures.” Be it remarked, however, that the date does not regard an event concerning Monk; no, it merely regards the time a story was told her by “Jane!” “Jane,” who knew of events “that had occurred” at the Asylum before Monk’s acquaintance with it, denies, nevertheless, that she is the author of the delectable story attributed to her.

The whole account given in the eighteenth chapter, of the manufacture and use of wax tapers at the Hotel Dieu, is notoriously false. We oppose, as witnesses on this point, the entire population of the city. It is stated, that the “Pope had given early notice that the burning of wax candles would afford protection from the disease, (the cholera,) and that his message was promulgated in the Gray Nunnery, the Congregational Nunnery, and to Catholics at large, through the pulpits.” As an instance of the loose manner in which these fabrications are constructed, the reader will remark that no mention is made of the promulgation of the “Pope’s message” at the Hotel Dieu, although it was in the latter institution, it is alleged, the “manufacturing business” was principally carried on. The origin of these lies must be looked for in the manufacturing experience gained by the pretended ex-nun at the Magdalen Asylum, and in the well-known use of wax tapers in the Roman Catholic worship. No “Pope’s message” was pro-

mulgated in Canada concerning the cholera, and the only document on the subject proceeding from the superior clergy of the church, was the following pastoral letter of the Right Rev. the Bishop of Quebec. The fanatics may make the most of it for farther exposures of "Popish superstitions :"

" You are aware, our very dear brethren, that an epidemical disease, known under the name of the *Cholera morbus*, having escaped from Asia, has exerted, for more than a year past, its terrible ravages in different European states, casting every where fright and consternation, and reaping on its passage a great number of victims. Until the present moment, contemplating it at a distance, we have lived in security, and have had only to lament the evils it has caused in the old world. But we are now disturbed from our repose by the progress of the disease, which, according to the last accounts, has already penetrated into various parts of England and Scotland, and has even made tremble the immense population of the metropolis.

" This plague seems to threaten us ; well-founded apprehensions have gained every mind. Our intimate relations with the mother-country give us reason to fear that the spring arrivals may carry to us the seed of this contagion.

" It is true, that our Provincial legislature, in its wisdom, has spared nothing to preserve us from so great a misfortune. By a special law, passed at its last session, a board of health has been formed, and instructions calculated to anticipate and arrest the effects of the disease are about to be distributed in our cities and throughout the country. But what may serve all these means of human prudence, if the God of mercy does not extend to us his pro-

tecting arm? *Nisi Dominus custodierit civitatem, frustra vigilat qui custodit eam.* (Ps. 126, v. 2.)

Moreover, O. V. D. B., if we are compelled to acknowledge in this calamity the effects of divine vengeance on the culpable nations of the earth, have we not just reason to fear that our multiplied iniquities may draw down on our heads the chastisement of an insulted and contemned Providence.

“Yes, O. V. D. B., we cannot dissimulate to ourselves: a dark cloud hangs over us; a contagion, a thousand times more disastrous than epidemical disease, commences to spread itself over our ancient soil, and to invade our ancient virtues: a torrent of disorders, inevitable consequences of the weakening of our faith, has already made strange ravages in our land, formerly so moral and so religious. It would not be surprising, if heaven, in its anger, should envelope us in a calamity, the destructive consequences of which have already been felt by so many nations.

“Under these circumstances, O. V. D. B., with a heart penetrated by the liveliest grief, we invite you to prepare for the day of mourning and affliction by a sincere return to righteousness. Let us implore together, and with tears, the goodness of our God, so much outraged by the perversity of the age. *Indulgentiam ejus fuis lacrymis postulemus.* (Judith, ch. 8. v. 14.) Let us bow down even to the dust in his presence, *humiliemus illi animas nostras,* (Ibid . . . v. 16.); and, following the example of the inhabitants of Nineveh, let each one be converted; let him abandon his evil ways and the iniquity of his hands. *Convertatur vir à viâ suâ et ab iniquitate quæ est in manibus eorum.* (Jonas, ch. 3. v. 8.) Who knows but that God, touched by our re-

pentance and our wailings, may turn to us and pardon us; but that his anger may be appeased, and the warrant against us withdrawn! *Quis scit si convertatur et ignoscat Deus et revertatur à furore iræ suæ et non peribimus?* (Ibid. v. 9).

“FOR THESE REASONS, and in the holy name of God, we have determined and ordered, and determine and order, what follows:

“1. On Friday, the fourth day of the month of May next, there shall be celebrated in all the parish churches which have resident curates, a solemn mass, *pro quocumque necessitate*; at the close of which shall be sung, on bended knees, the *Domine, non secundum*, &c. with the verse *ostende nobis Domine*, &c. and the orison *Deus, qui non mortem*, &c. as in the missal, in the mass, *pro vitandâ mortalitate*. We expect of the piety of our faithful diocessans, that they will sanctify the day in a special manner, by prayer, fasting, and repose.

“2. In all the churches and chapels of our diocese, where mass is celebrated in public, each Sunday or day of obligation, immediately after the parish mass, conventual or principal, the celebrating priest shall recite on his knees, and in a loud voice, to the responses of the people, five *Pater* and five *Ave Maria*; after which he shall recite the verse *ostende nobis*, &c. and the before-mentioned orison, *Deus, qui non mortem*, &c. We hope that such as cannot assist at the divine service, will recite the five *Pater* and *Ave Maria* in their families.

“3. Each priest shall add to the mass of the day, the orison, *ne despicias*, &c. as in the missal, (*inter orationes ad diversa*,) whenever the mass of the day shall not be of the 1st class, or solemn of

the 2nd class; and this same orison shall replace that marked *ad libitum* in the other masses.

“4. At all elevations shall be sung the anthem of St. Joseph, first patron of the diocese, *Esse fidelis servus*, &c. and the verse *Gloria et divitiæ*, &c. and the orison *sanctissimæ genetricis*, &c.

“5. The prayers prescribed in the three preceding articles shall commence the first Sunday after the 4th of May, and shall be continued until further notice.

“The present letter shall be read and published in every parish, and read in chapter in all religious communities the first Sunday after its reception, or the Sunday of *Quasimodo*. Those living in distant places, and who shall not receive it in time, shall publish it the first Sunday after its reception, and shall consecrate to the works hereinbefore determined the following Sunday.

“Given at Quebec, under our sign, the seal of our arms, and the countersign of our secretary, the ninth of April, eighteen hundred and thirty-two.

BERN. CL. BISHOP OF QUEBEC.”

By My Lord,

L.+S.

C. F. CAZEAU, *Pst. Secretary*.

It will be seen, that the letter contains several quotations from the “Bible,” and also that it is ordered to be read in *all* religious communities. It is not surprising that a prostitute should be ignorant of the use made of the Scriptures by the Catholic clergy; that she should confound a pastoral letter of the bishop with the “Pope’s message,” and that she should not know that the letter was read

in the Hotel Dieu. It will not, however, be doubted, that on all these points *nuns* are well informed. It is stated, for the satisfaction of the fanatics, that in the matters of praying and fasting, "Church of England superstition" had the advance of "Roman Catholic superstition." The proclamation of the Governor, on the same subject, is dated the fourth of April, eighteen hundred and thirty-two.

At page 195 it is stated, as a "remarkable fact," that "not one case of that disease (the cholera) existed in the nunnery during either of the seasons in which it proved so fatal in the city." We cannot give credit to the advisers of Monk for her complete conversion from the "Errors of Popery" to "pure Evangelism." She pretty clearly attributes the "remarkable fact" to the influence of the "wax tapers." After all, her story may be a sort of permitted Evangelical lie; for, in point of fact, in the ordinary sense, (not Monk's,) two nuns of the Hotel Dieu died of the Asiatic Cholera. The entire number of deaths among the sisterhood, from the year 1829 to the month of July, 1836, exclusive of murders or "strange disappearances," amount to six. Their graves may be visited by all whom it concerns.

"When the election riots prevailed in Montreal," is an approach to a date, and offers one of the two opportunities the reader of the "Disclosures" has of comparing the progress of external events with the internal history of the Hotel Dieu. That Monk was an inmate of the Hotel Dieu, is to be inferred by reflecting persons from the interesting "disclosure" that the riots "gave her serious thoughts," and that it was to her "own satisfaction" she ascertained there was "a quantity of gun-pow-

der in a state of preparation" under the direction of the superior of the convent !

Monk's "serious thoughts" are, in truth, a reminiscence of the Montreal house of correction. She was immured there during the election riots, and as the house is guarded by sentinels, she had an opportunity of smelling gunpowder. The "superior" of the house of correction at that time was Captain Holland.

The "punishment of the Cap," mentioned at page 201 and elsewhere, is a reminiscence of the early life of the pretended ex-nun. She has been afflicted from her youth with a malady in the ear, which compels her to wear a cap. It was the malady, not the cap, that "took away her reason." When the pain was excessive, various applications were made to her head to remove it. We have information on this point from Mrs. McDonell, Mrs. Monk, and several other persons. It seems, that if Monk had had an opportunity of examining her head, the "disclosures" might have been extended several chapters. The acquaintance of Monk with Dr. Neilson was not formed at the hospital, but at her mother's house. Her pretended attendance on Dr. Neilson at the Hotel Dieu Hospital was, as will be seen, a very hazardous fabrication.

"Popish priests," converted to "pure evangelism," may know that the "Agnus Dei" mentioned at page 213, is not so very rare an article as is implied in the "Disclosures." *Nuns* are more familiar with the "Agnus Dei" than women of the class of Maria Monk. The twentieth and last chapter of the "Disclosures" relates the "desperate" escape of Monk from the cloisters of the Hotel Dieu convent. The narrative need only be read

to be rejected. The fiction may be at once perceived without even comparing it with other parts of the "Disclosures." If we proceed to make the comparison, we shall discover that it is utterly at variance with previous statements. We cite the following additional instance of the contradictions in the "Disclosures," and we ask the candid reader if there can be found language too strong to express the just abhorrence which the conduct of the advisers of "Monk" must inspire. It is stated at page 222, that "it was well known to some of the nuns that she had twice left the convent from choice." Now we defy the most subtle inquirer to discover from the previous narrative that she had "twice left the convent," either "from choice" or otherwise. The only distinct and deliberate mention of her having left the convent occurs at page 43. We point out these signal and startling contradictions, not more for the purpose of convicting Monk, than with a view to hold up the infamous intentions and acts of men, who, in the presence of such manifest demonstration of the falsehood of the "Awful Disclosures," have nevertheless undertaken to uphold their truth and verisimilitude. It will be remembered, that without the countenance and support of those men, the "Awful Disclosures" would never have been published—never have been circulated—and most certainly would never have been believed.

CHAPTER V.

"I am willing to risk my credit for truth and sincerity on the general correspondence between my description and things as they are."

"Awful Disclosures," page 73.

THE strange audacity of the advisers and supporters of Monk in advancing her acquaintance with the interior of the Hotel Dieu Hospital and Convent, as a test of the truth of her narrative, is a piece of quackery of fatal contrivance. They appear not to have reflected that it was possible to meet them on this their own chosen ground, and convict them of the most deliberate forgery.

Previously to placing before the public the direct and conclusive refutatory evidence we are possessed of, we shall proceed to examine the description of the interior of the Hotel Dieu, with reference to its apparent credibility and compatibility with what is publicly known of that Hospital and Convent.

Even the introduction to the pretended description is deficient in truth and verisimilitude. It is stated at page 14, that "Monk is sensible that new walls may be constructed, or old ones removed;" and that "she has been credibly informed that masons have been employed in the nunnery since she left it." Monk's "architectural sensibility" must have been acquired during her recent residence in New-York, for it seems from the narrative, that during her pretended noviciate and nunship, her education in the more masculine arts was entirely neglected. The truth is, as every one who has been in Canada must well know, that the partition walls of stone buildings are there constructed of stone, and of great thickness. There is a possi-

bility of removing them, but only by removing the entire structure. The Hotel Dieu is a stone building, and its partition walls are of stone. The *credible* information of Monk is a sheer fabrication. Masons have not been employed in the "nunnery" for the purpose she mentions, or for any other. The contrary is of public notoriety.

The description of "the first story" commences with a signal blunder. It is stated, "that beginning at the extremity of the western wing of the convent, towards Notre Dame street, on the first story, there is—" Now, although the description is obviously intended for the "secluded apartments," it so happens that the "western wing" includes public hospital apartments only. Moreover, the ignorance of the authors of the Disclosures, of even the general appearance of the Hotel Dieu, may be inferred, when it is stated that the three wings of the Hotel Dieu extend equally towards "Notre Dame street;" or, in other words, that Notre Dame street runs nearly parallel to their extremities.

It is stated, in describing the first room of the first story, that the "nuns were sometimes required to bring wood from the yard, and pile it up for use." This is another fabrication. It is well known that the nuns are not menials, and that wood is "brought" and "piled" by domestics. In the description of the second story, it is stated to commence "beginning as before, at the western extremity of the north wing." The wings of the Hotel Dieu are two in number, one west, one east; and besides, there is one central structure. There is no "north wing," and consequently no "western extremity." It is, besides, impossible to conceive

the second story of a "north wing" as placed over the first story of a "western wing."

In the description of the seventh room of the second story, a most hideous charge is made against the nuns, which we shall notice only to express the profoundest scorn for the mean and degraded intellects that can entertain it for a single instant. As in the case of a similar charge brought against the priests, we pronounce it to be incompatible with the nature of things; incompatible with secrecy.

Our general remarks on this feigned description may be briefly summed up. Firstly, there are enumerated in it no less than five community rooms, and our explanation of what a community room is, given in a previous part of this refutation, must satisfy the reader that the description is a fabrication. Secondly, the manifest falsehood of the secret "bell pull" outside of the gate, is another proof of the stupid defamation. A secret "bell pull" outside of the gate, and in the public street! Thirdly, it cannot be inferred whether it is the description of the pretended ex-novice or the pretended ex-nun; it would appear to be from the former, for the following reasons. At page 77, Monk describes herself as ignorant of what was "beyond" the ninth apartment on the first story: and at page 81 she describes herself as doubtful of the extent of the "public hospitals." Now, at page 214 it is implied that there were only "three rooms" which she never entered, and in the nineteenth and twentieth chapters, we learn that she was an attendant in the hospitals, and of course acquainted with their extent.

If the description is from the pretended ex-no-

vice, why is that of the ex-nun held back? Who will undertake to reconcile these manifest contradictions; or who will account for them otherwise than by pronouncing the description an obvious fabrication? It is a fabrication. The "interior of the Black Nunnery" has been "examined" by competent persons, and has been found to be not only "materially different," but entirely different from the description given in the "disclosures." Their conclusive testimony will be found among the documentary evidence.

We are informed by Mrs. McDonnell that the whole is a reminiscence of the Asylum. The furniture is in many instances such as Monk saw at the Asylum; and the relative positions of the rooms and passages generally correspond.

We repeat, that the filthy turpitude of the abettors of Monk, in the matter of these "Disclosures," has never been surpassed; and that their fool-hardiness in committing themselves before the world in support of such a mass of clumsy and atrocious defamation, is without example in the annals of history. It is now our business to exhibit who Maria Monk really is, where she has lived, and how she has lived. This will be the subject of our next chapter.

CHAPTER VI.

Biographical article—on the Life of Maria Monk.

MARIA MONK was born at St. John's, Lower Canada, about the year 1817, and is now in her nine-

teenth year. Her mother, Mrs. Malcolm, house-keeper of the Rev. Hen. Esson, and several other persons personally acquainted with her, agree in representing that her age does not exceed nineteen. Previously to his marriage, the father of Maria Monk had been employed in an hotel at Quebec. The building did then belong, and we believe does still, to the Honorable Chief Justice Sewell. He was removed from Quebec, and placed, on the solicitation of the Honorable John Muri, in the situation of barrack-master at St. John's; where he married the mother of our heroine. At a very early age Maria attended the school of Mr. Adam Miller at St. John's, and there became acquainted with her master's son, Mr. William Miller; an acquaintance which has recently been renewed in the city of New-York under circumstances of mutual advantage to the parties. Her father died of apoplexy, at Laprairie, on the river St. Lawrence, about the year 1824; and shortly afterwards her mother removed to Montreal, and was appointed house-keeper of the government house; which situation she still retains. At the age of nine years Maria was sent to the poor school of the Congregation, and remained there about nine months. It is stated by her mother that Maria was at the Congregational school in the year 1825. The scholars at the poor school of the Congregation are divided into two classes. Parents able and willing, are charged the sum of two dollars and a half per annum for the instruction given at the poor school; and Mrs. Monk was one of those parents. Maria's conduct at school was not acceptable to her instructors, and her dismissal from the school was occasioned by some juvenile freaks, giving ample promise of the conduct

of matured age. The mother attributes the eccentricities of the daughter to an accident which befel her at St. John's. It appears that Maria, while at school, had her ear perforated by a slate pencil, and that a piece of the pencil has remained in her ear to this day. Her sufferings arising from this cause have been acute, and have led to the supposition that her intellect has been from the time of the accident seriously and badly affected. It is known to medical jurisconsults, that no question is of more difficult determination than that of alleged insanity. It is the opinion of Mrs. Monk, and others personally acquainted with Maria, that she is not insane; but still they deplore that her manner and conduct, from the time of the accident, have been marked by strange flightiness and unaccountable irregularities. Be this as it may, her mother has always found her a wayward child, and of difficult management. After her dismissal from the Congregation, she attended various schools, with indifferent success. Her mother's authority was insufficient to restrain her adventurous disposition; the physicians consulted on her malady, were unable to effect a cure; and she acquired among her acquaintances, a character for uncertainty of conduct and principle, which the subsequent events of her life have not helped to remove.

Dr. Nelson of the city of Montreal has known her from her youth, and often, on her mother's application, gave her medical advice. Dr. Nelson, and other medical practitioners consulted by her parent, agreed that an operation on the ear would be extremely hazardous. Thus it has happened that the cause of her malady still subsists, and that she still endures its effects.

In 1829 she escaped from her mother's protection, and made a voyage to Quebec on board the Hercules steamer, then commanded by Capt. Armstrong. Capt. Armstrong states that he looked upon Maria Monk as insane. She, in fact, attempted to throw herself out of the cabin window, and was only prevented from effecting her purpose by being locked up in a state room.

On her return to Montreal, her mother was induced to endeavor to get her received into a convent. Mrs. Monk applied for counsel and aid to several gentlemen, among whom may be named the Rev. H. Esson and Dr. Nelson. Her design could not be effected for a variety of reasons. Mrs. Monk was and is poor. Her sole dependence is on her situation at the government house, and the two shillings a day she there receives. The payments of Mrs. Monk's salary are made quarterly, through the commandant of the city of Montreal, and are so regulated that it is impossible they should be received by any other person than Mrs. Monk herself. Mrs. Monk's poverty was an obstacle not easily to be overcome. The laws of Canada require that persons taking the religious habit shall pay, as dowries, certain sums of money, and such payments are most generally made by the parents of the applicant: but in some instances subscriptions are entered into, and the religious vocation of a deserving object is secured by the contributions of the good and charitable. In the case of Maria Monk, there existed no inducement to confer on her disinterested benefactions. At the age of fourteen her character was notoriously bad, and petty larceny was with her no unfrequent crime. Mrs. Malcolm states, that Maria once applied to her for

some money, on pretence that she was desired to do so by her mother. Mrs. Malcolm gave the money, but subsequently ascertained that Maria had practised on her a gross deception. As the convents of Montreal are not asylums for corrected vice or reformed profligacy, Maria's previous habits rendered her admittance, even as a *postulante*, utterly impossible. Besides, Maria was not a Roman Catholic ; and her readiness to become one, to effect a special purpose, would not have been considered a sufficient guarantee against a possible relapse.

Discouraged in her endeavours, Mrs. Monk again resorted to her personal authority, but with little success. Her daughter became a confirmed vagrant.

In the years 1831, 1832, we find her at Sorel or William Henry, a town situate on the river Richelieu, about forty-five miles below Montreal. She there first resided with Charles Gouin, hotel keeper, and subsequently at Mrs. Monk's of the same place. From Mrs. Monk's she ran away, after having robbed the house of a quantity of wearing apparel, and proceeded to St. Ours, where she managed to procure employment at Mr. Pringle's, a farmer of that vicinity. Discovered and dismissed by Mr. Pringle, she proceeded to St. Denis, and in various occupations employed her time until the spring of 1834.

About the 12th of July in the same year, 1834, and shortly after her withdrawal from St. Denis, she was engaged as a domestic in the family of C. Lovis, watchmaker and jeweller, residing in Notre Dame street, opposite the Montreal seminary. Her conduct, in this situation, was not satisfactory

to her master; and her bad character, which was quickly ascertained, occasioned her dismissal about the 9th of August following. During her residence at the house of Mr. Lovis, Maria contrived to give evidence of a disturbed and ill-regulated intellect. She exhibited strange eccentricities, and laid claims to an interest and sympathy for her person which neither her conduct nor character entitled her to expect. She signified to Mr. Lovis her desire to embrace the Roman Catholic faith, and requested permission to prepare in his house for the re-baptism which she imagined the canons of the Roman Catholic church would require. Mr. Lovis treated her application as a pretence, and regarding her as an unworthy person, dismissed her from his service.

After her departure from the house of Mr. Lovis, it seems she took up her habitation in various brotels at Griffin Town, a suburb of Montreal, and elsewhere. At a subsequent period, in perambulating with Louis Malo, a constable of the Montreal courts, she pointed out various resorts of vice in which she had resided.

In the month of October, 1834, we find her at Varennes, a town fifteen miles from Montreal, on the opposite side of the river. She there committed a theft in the house of Girard, hotel-keeper, and returned to Montreal with various articles in her possession, among which were a lady's veil and a silver watch. The veil she disposed of in Griffin Town, and the watch she sold to Mr. George Savage, watchmaker, residing in St. Paul street in the city of Montreal. Girard, so soon as he discovered his loss, left Varennes in pursuit of the thief, and lodged information against her in the

Montreal police office. On his affidavit a warrant was immediately issued against the fugitive, and put for execution into the hands of the constable, Louis Malo. Malo, having information that Maria was concealed at Lachine, instantly proceeded there, and succeeded in securing her person. On her apprehension she confessed her guilt, and was carried in custody to the city. The veil could not be recovered, but the watch was immediately restored by Mr. Savage. Still in custody, she was then taken to Varennes to be identified; and, in consideration of her youth, and moved by her tears and entreaties, the injured parties consented to her release. It would seem that Maria is not deficient in personal charms, for she made an impression on the heart of the susceptible constable, who, taking her under his protection, returned with her to Montreal. Arrived in the city, she was placed, by the care of Constable Malo, in a tavern, which then existed at the corner of St. Joseph and Commission streets, and which was occupied by a person of the name of Richard Ouston. About this time her cohabitation with her protector, the constable, occurred.

On the 9th of November, in the same year, 1834, the spirit of adventure, which no circumstances had been able to control, again broke forth. On that day Maria's wanderings led her to the neighbourhood of the Lachine canal, into which she manifested a strong disposition to throw herself. Her movements having by chance been observed by some persons near her, they interfered with her self-sacrifice, and conveyed her to a house in the vicinity. After some hours spent in hysterics, moans, and lamentations, Maria's intellect and memory

cleared up, and she declared herself to be the daughter of Doctor W. Robertson, one of the city magistrates; but, on being confronted with that functionary, she gave her real name and parentage. She represented, however, that she had no home, and gave a confused and disjointed account of herself. Under these circumstances, she was committed to the house of correction as a vagrant, and remained there until the 19th of November. Her mother having learned her situation, procured her liberation, and took her to the government house, of which she was the keeper.

Whilst in jail, she was seen and spoken to by Mrs. Beaudry, a lady whose charitable intentions frequently conducted her to scenes of misery and distress. Affected by the forlorn condition in which she saw Maria, she represented her case to Mrs. McDonell, and prevailed on that lady to receive her as an inmate of the Magdalen Asylum. She was accordingly conducted there, and entered towards the close of the month of November.

In the Magdalen Asylum she was still Maria Monk, wavering and fanciful. All efforts to restore her to a regulated mode of thought and action proved unavailing. It was even discovered that the seclusion of the Asylum did not prevent her from renewing her intercourse with the constable. She received his visits, and held converse with him through the yard enclosure. At the Asylum, Maria was visited by her mother, who did not fail to discover that she was in a state of pregnancy. The same was also remarked by Mrs. McDonell, and other persons about her. Her conduct, finally, became so insupportable, that Mrs. McDonell was compelled to dismiss her, and she returned to her

mother's charge at the beginning of the month of March, 1835.

Maria speedily tired of her home, and left it early in summer. It was not known where she had gone. It was supposed that she had returned to her ancient haunts within the limits of the province, but it soon appeared, that with increased experience she was induced to extend the field of her operations. She had gone to New-York, and on the nineteenth of August, in the summer of 1835, she arrived at the Exchange Coffee House, Montreal, in company with a person named Hoyte, who passed for a preacher, and of a person named Turner, who passed for a judge. The judge, the preacher, and the prostitute having clubbed their wisdom and inventive powers, passed some time in laying the foundation of charges which were afterwards to be preferred against the priests and nuns of Lower Canada. The parties, however, could not long agree. The judge, a man waxed in years, and probably not possessed of more wickedness of heart than might be expected from a determined Calvinist, became disgusted with his companions, and returned to the green hills of Vermont, with the consolation of having wandered from them on a witless and worthless errand. The prostitute also became restive. She left the preacher, and the child she called his, at the hotel, and made her way to a notorious house of ill-fame in one of the city suburbs. She was there visited by Constable Malo, to whom she expressed herself in bitter terms of the preacher, and declared her determination never to have any thing more to say to him. She yielded, however, to the persuasion of the preacher, and was induced to leave the brothel in his compa-

ny. Some two or three scenes occurred between Maria, her mother, and Hoyte, in which the conduct of the latter was not entirely agreeable to our notions of clerical, or even semi-clerical, pudicity.

Maria, again in the power of Hoyte, was quickly removed by him to New-York, beyond the reach of farther interference. In that city, and toward the close of the year eighteen hundred and thirty-five, were published the "Awful Disclosures," which have given so much celebrity to the name of Monk, and even to that of Jane Ray, one of her companions at the Magdalen Asylum. In New-York she still lives, regarded and honored as a martyr to the cause of pure evangelism.

The author of this article understands that the preacher Hoyte, having been crowded out by more ambitious aspirants, the company of anti-papists at present consists of W. C. Brownlee, Maria Monk, John S. Slocum, William Miller, recently of Montreal, Andrew Bruce, a "lady," also recently of Montreal, D. Fanshaw, and others.

CHAPTER VII.

Documentary evidence, proving that from her early youth Maria Monk has led the life of a vagrant, and that on the first of January, 1831, during the election riots, during the Cholera season of 1832, during the Cholera season of 1834, the only periods mentioned in the "Awful Disclosures" as periods during which Maria Monk was an inmate of the Hotel Dieu, she was in reality residing at various other places in and about Montreal.

It would be possible to produce here evidence bearing on the life and adventures of Maria Monk,

from her infancy to the present moment. She is still young—very young; her personal acquaintances are to be met with in numerous directions on the banks of the St. Lawrence and Richelieu rivers, and very little trouble would have enabled us to exhibit her entire career from the “Primer” to the “Disclosures;” but it would not be interesting to the public to know more of the history of Maria Monk than is necessary, in all reason, for the refutation of her pretensions, and the exposure of the imposition which has been attempted in her name on popular credulity. The task of unfolding the immorality of this wretched woman is any thing but pleasing. It is not undertaken to gratify idle curiosity, but to vindicate from atrocious aspersions the characters of men whom we deeply venerate—to redeem from calumny the noble lives of good, peaceful, and charitable women.

When this refutation and these proofs shall meet the eye of the scurrilous and unhesitating defamer, will he not seek to escape the light of day and the regards of his fellow-men? The turbid current of his deliberate and blasphemous fanaticism will be heated by hot shame and unavailing regret. The stupid and lying wretch, the base knave, the imbecile criminal, will writhe in his anguish, scorned and loathed by an insulted and indignant community. We have carried back our inquiries into the adventures of Monk as far as the year 1831; she was then in her fifteenth year. It cannot be said positively that it is not pretended that she was a *professed nun* years previously to that age; but we have reason to believe, from the language held by her supporters in the public prints, that her conventual trials principally occurred in

the years 1831, 1832, 1833, and 1834. We now proceed to exhibit our first document.

No. 1. *Evidence of Charles Gouin.*

The undersigned having been requested to state what he knows concerning Maria Monk, daughter of Mrs. Monk, house-keeper of the house known as the Government House in Montreal, declares,—That the said Maria Monk entered into his service at Sorel, or William Henry, as a menial, about the month of November, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-one; and that she remained in it until the month of September nearly of the following year. The undersigned declares that the said Maria remained in his service during all the time of the Cholera of one thousand eight hundred and thirty-two; the undersigned has understood that when the said Maria left his service, she made a voyage to Quebec—that on her return therefrom, she took service at Mrs. Monk's of Sorel, or William Henry; that she there committed a theft; and that the stolen articles were found in her possession. The undersigned declares that the said Maria Monk told him that the said Mrs. Monk of Montreal was not her mother proper, but her step-mother; which allegation the undersigned subsequently found to be false. The undersigned declares that the said Maria, at the time he knew her, appeared to be about fourteen or fifteen years old. The undersigned declares that he has never understood, except from public reports recently spread, that the said Maria hath made any residence whatever in any Convent.

(Signed)

CHAS. GOUIN.

Mr. Gouin is a man of years, and keeper of the principal hotel of Sorel. His evidence proves—

1. That in the year 1831 and 1832, Monk was in his service for the space of about ten months.
2. That she was in his service, during the cholera season of 1832.
3. That while in his service, she denied her own mother. The conduct of Monk, towards her mother has always been ungrateful; and her habit of indulging in calumnious remarks on her parent could be testified to by hundreds of witnesses.

No. 2. *Evidence of Mrs. Monk of Sorel.*

Sorel, 24th July, 1836.

The undersigned, being requested to state her information and knowledge concerning Maria Monk, daughter to Mrs. Monk, house-keeper of the Government House in the city of Montreal, hereby declares that Maria Monk entered her service as domestic in the Autumn of 1832; that the undersigned understood that Maria had just returned from Quebec; and that a short time previously she had been employed as a domestic in the hotel kept by C. Gouin at Sorel; that having remained about one week in the service of the undersigned, Maria Monk secretly withdrew from it, carrying with her a quantity of wearing apparel belonging to the undersigned; that Maria was immediately pursued to St. Ours, a village about twelve miles from the borough of Sorel, and there discovered with the stolen articles in her possession; but that in consequence of her extreme youth she was released from custody, and suffered to go at liberty. The undersigned has never understood, except from recent public report, that Maria had been at any time an inmate of a convent.

(Signed) MARY ANGELICA MONK.

To guard against error from the similarity of names, it is proper to state that Mrs. Monk is no wise connected with Monk the thief. Mrs. Monk's evidence proves the commission of the crime of theft, and corroborates the evidence of Mr. Gouin. On the liberation of Monk from custody, she attempted to pass herself on Mr. Pringle, a farmer of St. Ours, as an honest girl; and indeed was in his service for a few days; but Mr. Pringle quickly ascertained her character, and dismissed her with ignominy.

The inhabitants of the Canadian villages are simple and primitive in their manners, slow to suspect the existence of vice, slow to detect it. Monk is represented by all who knew her, as having been at one time a girl of extremely interesting appearance. Immediately after her dismissal from the house of Mr. Pringle, she fled from St. Ours, and made her way to St. Denis, a village about twelve

miles distant. The communications between the French, and scattered English inhabitants of the parishes, are as slight as it is possible to imagine. Monk met, therefore, with no difficulty in procuring employment, in a Canadian family ; and she accordingly took service in the house of Mr. St. Germain, a respectable tradesman and mechanic of St. Denis. Mr. St. Germain, is since deceased ; but his widow has furnished us with the following notarial deposition.

No. 3. *Evidence of Mrs. St. Germain.*

Sorel, 23d July, 1836.

In the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-six, and on the twenty-third day of July, before the Notary undersigned, residing in the borough of St. Denis, appeared Angelica Hodgins, widow of the late Anthony Gazaille *dit* St. Germain, in his lifetime hatter, of the said borough of St. Denis, who said and declared that she knew well the so-called Maria Monk, and that the said Maria was employed in the service of deponent from about the first day of October, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-two, to the month of March, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-three ; and further deponent declared *not.*

(Signed) ANG. HODGINS.
(Signed) E. MINAULT, N. P.

This deposition carries us forward six months, to the spring of 1833. On leaving Mrs. St. Germain's, Monk became dependent on the charity of various individuals, and remained, for about two months, without any fixed employment. She was regarded by the inhabitants of the village as a girl of at least doubtful virtue. This circumstance compelled her to quit it. She wandered into the country, and prevailed on the untutored peasants to employ her as a teacher of English.

No. 4. Evidence of Michael Guertin.

In the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-six, and the twenty-third day of July, before the Notary of the Province of Lower Canada, undersigned—appeared,

Michael Guertin, farmer, of the parish of St. Denis, who said and declared, that he knew well the so-called Maria Monk; that she kept a school in his house from about the fifteenth of the month of May, in the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-three, to the end of the month of June of the same year. And further deponent declared, that he did not know how to sign—wherefore he made his mark

Signed) MICHAEL ^{his} + GUERTIN
mark.
E. MINAULT, N. P.

The deponent Guertin granted her the use of a room, and the neighbours were invited to send their children to the English mistress. At Guertin's and other places in the immediate neighbourhood she pursued her adopted profession during the spring, summer and autumn of 1833, and on the 2d of December in the same year entered the employment of Miss Louise Bousquet, government school mistress, as her English assistant.

No. 5. Evidence of Louise Bousquet.

In the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-six, and on the twenty-fourth day of July, before the undersigned Notary Public, residing in the borough of St. Denis, appeared Louise Bousquet, wife of Jean Baptiste Archambeau, and declared,—

That in the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-three, deponent was mistress of the Government School at St. Denis, District of Montreal; that in the same year she knew in the village of St. Denis a young girl named Maria Monk; that on the second of December, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-three, the same said Maria Monk came and resided with the said deponent as her assistant in the instruction in English of the children committed to her care; that the said Maria remained in the employment of deponent about seven months or thereabouts, and that she left it about the month of July, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-four; that during her stay with deponent, her conduct was not satisfactory; that deponent was informed that

the said Maria, on leaving the house of deponent, withdrew from St. Denis; that deponent had been informed and believed that the entire stay of the said Maria at St. Denis embraced a period of eighteen months; that deponent having been informed, that in a book published at New-York, recital is made of certain relations alleged to have existed heretofore between deponent and the said Maria, deponent declared such recital to be absolutely false, with the single exception hereinbefore mentioned; that deponent having been informed that it is therein said that the said Maria, during her residence with deponent, wore on her person a bag containing hair of the superior of the *Hotel Dieu* Convent of Montreal, deponent declared that she had no knowledge of it; that having been informed that it is said in the same book that the said Maria was married during her residence with deponent, and that she consulted deponent on the subject of her marriage, deponent said and declared that she was a total stranger to such alleged marriage; and moreover positively denied the part imputed to her therein, or any other part whatever; that having been informed that it is said in the same book that deponent had consented to make certain representations concerning the said Maria to the Superior of the *Hotel Dieu*, deponent positively denied having given such consent, denied having been spoken to on the subject, or having any knowledge or information of the transaction mentioned in the said book, being, in all respects and unreservedly, a total stranger to it; that having been informed that it is said in the same book that deponent went to the said *Hotel Dieu* to inquire for a certain "St. Francis," deponent positively denied it; and moreover declared that *she never had* an acquaintance living in the *Hotel Dieu* of the said name of St. Francis; and deponent further declared, that in the summer of eighteen hundred and thirty-four, Mr. Lord the bishop made an episcopal visit to St. Denis; that on the day the confirmations were made in the parish church, the said Maria pretended to deponent that she had been confirmed on the same occasion, but with what truth deponent cannot say; and further deponent declared, that during the stay of the said Maria at St. Denis, Mr. Bedard was Curate of the parish, and Mr. Birs his Vicar. And deponent further declared, that she had never understood, except from recent public report, that the said Maria had been at any time a Novice, or Sister, or inmate in any Convent whatever.

And deponent further declared, that in the month of August, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-five, deponent received from Montreal two letters, one in the English language and the other in the French language; that the French letter was signed "Ambroise Vigeant," and that it invited deponent to proceed to Montreal to receive two hundred pounds currency which a lady there at Montreal was commissioned to give her; that the English letter was signed "Hoyte," but that deponent, from her ignorance of the language, remained ignorant of its contents.

And deponent further declared, that deponent did accordingly proceed to Montreal, and having communicated with the said "Ambroise Vigeaut," the said Ambroise Vigeaut informed deponent that the said Maria, in company with a man dressed in black, had requested of him very earnestly to write to the deponent, with which request he was induced to comply; that deponent did then proceed to call upon the mother of the said Maria at the Government House, and that the said mother said to deponent that her daughter, the said Maria, was a victim and an unfortunate; that deponent handed the said letters to the said mother, who, in an angry manner, burned them on the spot; and that deponent paid no further attention to the said invitation, or to the matter it relates to; and further deponent declared not

(Signed, after perusal) LOUISE BOUSQUET,

Femme Archambeau.

(Signed) E. MINAULT, N. P.

The part attributed to Miss Bousquet, in the "Awful Disclosures," is more than she will confess to. She is now married, and the curious traveller visiting the so called Sixth Concession, nine miles east of the village of St. Denis, will find her the happy and contented wife of John Baptiste Archambeau, enjoying some reminiscences of Maria Monk, but wholly dead to the memory of the murdered St. Francis. The evidence of Madame Archambeau proves that the residence of Monk in and about the parish of St. Denis was extended to the month of July, 1834. It moreover corroborates the evidence of Mrs. St. Germain and of Michael Guertin on the entire period of the residence of Maria Monk at St. Denis. It will be observed that she entered the service of Mrs. St. Germain in the autumn of 1832, and that she lost her situation with Miss Bousquet in the summer of 1834.

As is stated in the deposition of Miss Bousquet, Monk then withdrew from St. Denis. It cannot be said Monk's vicious propensities slumbered while she was in the country; for it is certain that the deponents of St. Denis, who are silent on her moral

conduct might have stated much against it. That she was a girl practised in evil, may be inferred from the evidence of Cournoier, commonly called Martel Paul.

No. 6. *Evidence of Martel Paul Hus Cournoier.*

District of Montreal:

Personally came and appeared before me, Edward W. Carter, one of his Majesty's Justices for the District of Montreal, Martel Paul Hus Cournoier, who being duly sworn on the Holy Evangelists—declared,—

That deponent was personally acquainted with Maria Monk, daughter to Mrs. Monk, house-keeper of the Government House in the city of Montreal; that he knew her from her infancy, and was personally acquainted with her late father, W. Monk, Barrack-master at St. John's, Lower Canada; and that he was personally acquainted with her mother; that deponent always believed, and did still believe, that the said Maria was the proper daughter of the said Mrs. Monk; that deponent, until within the last two or three years had always been in the habit of seeing the said Maria from time to time; that deponent had known of her residence at various places, and particularly of her residence at Charles Gouin's, and Mrs. Monk's of the borough of Sorel; and also of her residence at Montreal; at St. Ours, and at St. Denis; and of sundry voyages performed by her to Quebec; that deponent knew of the theft committed by her at the said Mrs. Monk's of Sorel, and was present at the time of her arrest at the house of a person named Leclair, at St. Ours.

And deponent further declared, that from the age of fourteen or fifteen the said Maria had been, according to the belief and information of deponent, a person of debauched habits, and that her illicit intercourse with various persons known to deponent was of public notoriety.

And deponent further declared, that it was not the belief of deponent that the said Maria had been at any time an inmate of any convent whatever, and that deponent had many strong and conclusive reasons for believing that the said Maria was a total stranger to the convents of Lower Canada. And further deponent declared not.

(Signed) ^{his} MARTEL + PAUL.
mark.

Taken and sworn to before me, this 24th
day of July, 1836.

(Signed) W. CARTER, J. P.

This affidavit corroborates moreover the evidence of Mr. Charles Gouin and Mrs. Monk of Sorel, and of Mrs. St. Germain, Michael Guertin, and Louise Bousquet of St. Denis.

It appears that Monk proceeded directly from St. Denis to Montreal, for on the 12th of July, and shortly after her separation from Miss Bousquet, we find her entered as domestic in the family of Mr. Lovis of that city.

No. 7. *Evidence of Charles D. S. Lovis.*

Province of Lower Canada, District of Montreal:

Before me, Peter Lukin, one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the District of Montreal, appeared Charles D. S. Lovis, Watchmaker and Jeweller, who, on making oath on the Holy Evangelists, declared :

That Maria Monk came to live in his family as a servant girl, on or about the 12th of July, 1834, and remained in his service until the 7th or 8th of August of the same year; when it being perceived that she was often deranged in her mind, and it being discovered that her conduct and character were notoriously bad, she was discharged; that the said Maria Monk stated to deponent, that she wished to become a Roman Catholic, and that she was preparing to be baptized, and that she asked deponent's permission to prepare herself in his house for that purpose.

(Signed) CHARLES D. S. LOVIS.

Sworn before me, at Montreal, the 8th of July, 1836.

(Signed) P. LUKIN, J. P.

The cholera of 1834 broke out in Montreal on precisely the very day that Maria Monk took service in the family of Mr. Lovis. She was dismissed from the employment of Mr. Lovis early in the month of August, and shortly after performed an expedition to Sorel; for what object we have not troubled ourselves to discover.

No. 8. *Evidence of Lawrence Kidd, Esq.*

In the summer of 1834 I was coming one Sunday morning from my cottage in the Quebec suburbs, when I met Capt. Ryan, master of the "Canadian Patriot," steamer. Capt. Ryan informed me that he had arrived from Quebec that morning; that he was then in search of Maria Monk, who had come up with him from Sorel, and whom he suspected of having stolen his watch from on board the boat. Capt. Ryan further told me, that Monk had journeyed in his boat from Sorel to Montreal; that on coming on board of the boat previously to its departure from Sorel, she addressed him on deck, and asked him if he did not recognize her; that at first he did not, but afterwards did recognize her; and being acquainted with her mother as well as with her late father, and having taken compassion on her destitute condition, he sent her down to the cabin. And further, Capt. Ryan informed me, that on the arrival of the steamer at Montreal, Maria Monk disappeared without communicating with him, and that he had reason to believe that she had stolen his watch. I have no positive knowledge of the steps taken by Capt. Ryan, subsequently to my conversation with him; but am under the impression that Monk successfully evaded his search.

I saw Capt. Ryan lately, who is still impressed with the same idea, that she was the person who stole his watch.

(Signed) LAWRENCE KIDD.

Mr. Kidd is one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the District of Montreal. It does not appear from the evidence of Mr. Kidd, in what month of the summer of 1834 Monk made the journey there mentioned; but by recurring to the evidence of Miss Bousquet, as to the time of her withdrawal from her service (July), and to the evidence of Mr. Lovis as to the time of her entrance into his service (12th July), it will be perceived that the journey must have been made subsequently to the 8th of August. It is doing Monk no injury to believe that she stole Capt. Ryan's watch. The unfortunate woman has committed crimes which obscure stealing.

It is no libel to write Maria Monk a thief.

No. 9. Evidence of Louis Malo.

Province of Lower Canada, District of Montreal:

Personally came and appeared before me, Lawrence Kidd, Esq., one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the said district, this twenty-fourth day of March, 1836, Louis Malo, of the city of Montreal, in the said district, Constable, who after being duly sworn on the Holy Evangelists, deposeth and saith, that on the eleventh day of October of the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-four, a warrant, of which follows a true copy, was placed in his hands for execution—to wit:

"PEACE OFFICE.

"Province of Lower Canada, District of Montreal:

"Joseph Antoine Gagnon, Esquire, one of the Justices of our Lord the King, assigned to keep the peace within the said district.

"To the High Constable, all other constables, peace officers, and others, the ministers of our said Lord the King within the said district, and to every of them—Greeting:—

"Whereas, a woman whose name is unknown, to be pointed out by Jean Baptiste Girard, of the parish of Varennes, in the county of Vercheres and district aforesaid, Inn-keeper, stands charged upon oath with having, on the eighth day of October instant, feloniously taken, stolen, and carried away from the dwelling-house of the said Jean Baptiste Girard, a silver watch, of the value of two pounds currency, and a variety of other goods and effects, the property of the said Jean Baptiste Girard.

"These are, therefore, to authorize and command you, or any of you, in his Majesty's name, forthwith to apprehend and bring before me, or some other of his Majesty's Justices of the peace for the said district, the body of the said woman; further, that you make a diligent search among the effects of the said woman for the said stolen goods; to answer the said charge, and to be further dealt with according to law. Herein fail not. Given under my hand and seal, at Montreal, the eleventh day of October, in the fifth year of his Majesty's reign."

(Signed) J. A. GAGNON, J. P.

That the deponent being then charged with the execution of the said warrant, did, on the same eleventh day of October, go in pursuit of the woman therein mentioned, accompanied by the said Jean Baptiste Girard, and overtook her at the parish of Lachine, in the District of Montreal, at a distance of nine miles from the city of Montreal, she being then on board of the steam-boat Chateauguay. That the said woman having been pointed out to deponent by the said Jean Baptiste Girard as being the woman mentioned in the said warrant; he, the said deponent, by virtue of the said warrant, made her a prisoner, and took her into his custody and keeping; that all the goods stolen from the said Jean Baptiste Girard were found in her possession, part of which, wo-

men's clothes, she wore on her person, and the remainder she carried in a bundle, with the exception of the said silver watch and a veil, which she stated she had sold in Montreal prior to her departure from there; and that she would show to the deponent the persons to whom she had made sale of them. That she then named herself Maria Mills, and on the road to Montreal, about half way from Lachine, she remarked that she would not like to be seen by persons who were working in a field adjacent to the road, as her uncle, Mr. Mills, lived there. That after having reached Montreal, she took the deponent and the said Jean Baptiste Girard to the jeweller's-shop of Messrs. Savage in St. Paul-street, stating that she had sold the said watch there for the sum of two dollars; which was, on the application to Mr. Savage, immediately returned to the said Jean Baptiste Girard. That she then took them to a house in the St. Ann suburbs, where she stated she had sold the veil; but the veil could not be obtained there, as the people denied the fact; that she was then taken (that night) to a tavern kept by one William Brown, at the New-market of this city, and there kept during the night under the charge of the said Jean Baptiste Girard. That on the morning following, the deponent, the said Jean Baptiste Girard, and the said woman who named herself Maria Mills, left Montreal for the parish of Varennes, the residence of the said Jean Baptiste Girard, fifteen miles from Montreal, and hired a ferryman named Peter Plouff to convey them by water to that place. That after having reached Varennes, she taxed the servant-maid of the said Girard with having stolen the said effects, and given them to her in a bundle. That the said Girard and his family, being convinced of the falsity of the story, did not believe her; and would not allow her to sleep in their house that night; when deponent was obliged to provide lodgings for her at a tavern kept by a widow named Therese Delfause. That on the morning following, the said Jean Baptiste Girard having positively declined prosecuting the charge any further on account of the respectability of her family and her youth, the deponent brought her back to Montreal. That whilst at Varennes, she told the said deponent that her real name was Maria Monk, and that she was the daughter of a Mrs. Monk, who was living at the Government House in the city of Montreal; which the deponent subsequently ascertained was the truth, and requested of the deponent not to take her to her mother, as she would chain her up and make her suffer as she had done before. That the deponent taking pity on her, took her to an inn kept in Commissioners-street by one Richard Ouston, where she remained two or three days; after which she left that house, and the deponent does not know where she went to; but in a few days subsequently, the deponent was sent for by a young boy, who told him there was a young woman at the New-market, in a tavern kept by one John Irvn, desirous of seeing him. That the deponent having gone there was directed to a room in which he found the said

Maria Monk; who, among other things, told the deponent that she intended leaving for Quebec. That they then parted, and the deponent never heard of her afterwards, until about the early part of the month of September last, when, on arriving home in the afternoon, he was informed that the servant of one Josephine Raymond, widow of the late John George Dagan, had come there to request the deponent to go to the said Josephine Raymond's residence; that there was a young woman there from New-York desirous of seeing deponent. That the deponent having gone there, found that the young woman in question was the said Maria Monk before mentioned. That she then told the deponent that she had just arrived from New-York, with her friend, the Rev. Mr. Hoyt; that they had taken lodgings at Goodenough's hotel; but that she had run away from him and left him his child; she also stated that she did not know how to get her clothes from Goodenough's hotel; that she would no longer live with the said Hoyt, as she did not like him; and that she would do any thing sooner than return with him, the said Hoyt. The deponent then advised her to return to her mother, which she declined doing. That on the day following, the deponent saw the said Maria Monk before the house of the said widow Dagan in a calash, with a person of genteel appearance, whom she called her friend, and which the deponent took to be the said Rev. Mr. Hoyt. That the said Josephine Raymond, widow of the late John George Dagan, keeps a house of ill fame in St. Elizabeth-street, of the city of Montreal. That the deponent has never since seen the said Maria Monk.

(Signed) LOUIS MALO.

Sworn before me, at Montreal, the day and
year above mentioned.

(Signed) LAWRENCE KIDD, J. P.

From the affidavit of Malo, it appears that he knew of her whereabouts for several days subsequently to the 11th of October, 1834. The elections for the city of Montreal commenced on the 28th of the same month, and the riots in the first week of the following month. The latter were continued throughout nearly the whole of November. On the 9th of November, Monk was committed to the house of correction.

No. 10. *Evidence of Doctor Robertson.*

William Robertson, of Montreal, Doctor in Medicine, being duly sworn on the Holy Evangelists, deposeth and saith as follows:

On the 9th of November, 1834, three men came up to my house, having a young female in company with them, who, they said, was observed that forenoon, on the bank of the Canal, near the extremity of the St. Joseph suburbs, acting in a manner which induced some people who saw her to think that she intended to drown herself. They took her into a house in the neighborhood, where, after being there some hours, and interrogated as to who she was, &c., she said she was the daughter of Dr. Robertson. On receiving this information, they brought her to my house. Being from home when they came to the door, and learning from Mrs. Robertson that she had deceived them, they conveyed her to the watch-house. On returning home and hearing this story, I went in company with G. Auldjo, Esq., of this city, to the watch-house to inquire into the affair. There we found the young female, whom I have since ascertained to be Maria Monk, daughter of Mrs. Monk of this city, in custody. She said, that although she was not my daughter, she was the child of respectable parents in or very near Montreal, who, from some light conduct of hers, (arising from temporary insanity, to which she was at times subject from her infancy,) had kept her confined and chained in a cellar for the last four years. Upon examination, no mark or appearance indicating the wearing of manacles, or any other mode of restraint, could be discerned. She said, on my observing this, that her mother always took care to cover the irons with soft cloths to prevent them injuring the skin. From the appearance of her hands, she evidently had not been used to work. To remove her from the watch-house, where she was confined with some of the most profligate women of the town, taken up for inebriety and disorderly conduct in the streets, as she could not give a satisfactory account of herself, I, as a Justice of the Peace, sent her to jail as a vagrant. The following morning I went to the jail for the purpose of ascertaining, if possible, who she was. After considerable persuasion, she promised to divulge her secret to the Rev. H. Esson, one of the clergymen of the Church of Scotland, to whose congregation she said her parents belonged. That gentleman did call at the jail, and ascertain who she was. In the course of a few days she was released, and I did not see her again until the month of August last, when Mr. Johnston, joiner, and Mr. Cooley, of the St. Ann Suburbs, merchant, called upon me about ten o'clock at night, and, after some prefatory remarks, mentioned that the object of their visit was, to ask me, as a magistrate, to institute an inquiry into some very serious charges which had been made against some of the Roman Catholic priests of the place and the nuns of the General Hospital, by a female, who had been a nun in that institution for four years, and who had divulged the horrible secrets of that establishment, such as the illicit and criminal intercourse between the nuns and the priests, stating particulars of such depravity of conduct on the part of these people, and their murdering the offspring of these

criminal connections as soon as they were born, to the number of from thirty to forty every year. I instantly said that I did not believe a word of what they told me, and that they must have been imposed upon by some evil disposed and designing person. Upon inquiry who this nun, their informant, was, I discovered that she answered exactly the description of Maria Monk, who I had so much trouble about last year; and mentioned to these individuals my suspicion, and what I knew of that unfortunate girl. Mr. Cooley said to Mr. Johnston, let us go home, we are hoaxed. They told me that she was then at Mr. Johnston's house, and requested me to call there, and hear her own story. The next day, or the day following, I did call, and saw Maria Monk, at Mr. Johnston's house. She repeated in my presence the substance of what was mentioned to me before, relating to her having been in the nunnery for four years; having taken the black veil; the crimes committed there; and a variety of other circumstances concerning the conduct of the priests and nuns. A Mr. Hoyte was introduced to me, and was present during the whole of the time that I was in the house. He was represented as one of the persons who had come in from New-York with this young woman, for the purpose of investigating into this mysterious affair. I was asked to take her deposition, on oath, as to the truth of what she had stated. I declined doing so, giving as a reason, that, from my knowledge of her character, I considered her deposition upon oath not entitled to more credit than her bare assertion, and that I did not believe either; intimating, at the same time, my willingness to take the necessary steps for a full investigation, if they could get any other person to corroborate any part of her testimony, or if a direct charge were made against any particular individual of a criminal nature. During the first interview with Messrs. Johnston and Cooley, they mentioned that Maria Monk had been found in New-York in a very destitute situation by some charitable individuals, who administered to her necessities; that being very sick, she expressed a wish to see a clergyman, as she had a dreadful secret which she wished to divulge before she died. A clergyman visiting her, she related to him the alleged crimes of the priests and nuns of the General Hospital at Montreal. That after her recovery she was visited and examined by the mayor and some lawyers at New-York, afterwards at Troy in the State of New-York, on the subject; and I understood them to say, that Hoyte and two other gentlemen, one of them a lawyer, were sent to Montreal with her for the purpose of examining into the truth of the accusations thus made. Although incredulous as to the truth of Maria Monk's story, I thought it incumbent upon me to make some inquiry concerning it, and have ascertained where she had been residing, a great part of the time she states having been an inmate of the nunnery. During the summer of 1832 she was at service in William Henry; the winters of 1832-3 she passed in this neighborhood, at St. Ours and St. Denis. The

accounts given of her conduct that season corroborate the opinions I had before entertained of her character.

W. ROBERTSON.

Sworn before me, at Montreal, this 14th day
of November, 1835.

BENJ. HOLMES, J. P.

The date of her liberation is not mentioned in Doctor Robertson's affidavit; but on referring to the jail record, the order for her discharge was found entered on the 15th of November.

There are four periods mentioned in the "Disclosures," at which it is pretended that Monk was an inmate of the Hotel Dieu. We shall notice them in the order we find them, and in the identical language of the narrative.

Period first, refers to a story related to Monk by Jane Ray, "on new year's day, 1834." (page 192.) The evidence of Miss Bousquet (No. 5) conclusively proves that Monk was in her employment previously to that date, at that date, and for months subsequently.

Period second, refers to the election riots, and is mentioned at page 192 as one of the few occasions "in which the nuns knew anything that was happening in the world." Within the recollection of Maria Monk there have been two "election riots" in the city of Montreal, one in May, 1832, and the other in November, 1834. The evidence of Mr. Gouin (No. 1) conclusively proves, that in May, 1832, she was in his service, as a menial. The evidence of Dr. Robertson (No. 10), and concurrent evidence, prove conclusively, that in November, 1834, her life was varied by street vagrancy and imprisonment.

Period third, or cholera season of 1832, is mentioned inclusively with period fourth at page 192.

"The appearance of the cholera in both cases of its ravages, gave us abundance of occupation."

The evidence of Mr. Gouin (No. 1) conclusively proves, that in the cholera season of 1832, Maria Monk was residing at Sorel, and in his house.

Period fourth, or cholera season of 1834—The evidence of Mr. Lovis (No. 6) and concurrent evidence prove that Maria Monk spent one part of the cholera season at service, and the remainder as a vagrant thief.

What remains ?

CHAPTER VIII.

Documentary evidence proving that all the material allegations of the "Awful Disclosures," concerning persons and things, are utter and absolute falsehoods.

SHORTLY after her liberation from jail, Maria Monk became an inmate of the Asylum for repentant females, managed and conducted by the exemplary and charitable Mrs. McDonell. Mrs. McDonell's affidavit exposes the source of the foolish and childish fabrications regarding conventual discipline, which occupy more than one half of the "Disclosures."

No. 11. *Evidence of Mrs. McDonell*

Province of Lower Canada, District of Montreal:

Before me, Adam L. Macnider, one of the Justices of the Peace, for the District of *Montreal*, appeared Agathe Henriette Huguet Latour, widow of the late Duncan Cameron McDonell, who, after making oath on the Holy Evangelists—declared:

That for six years past, she had conducted and managed an institution in the city of Montreal, commonly known and distin-

gushed as the Magdalen Asylum; that about the close of the month of November, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-four, Maria Monk, daughter of Mrs. W. Monk, house-keeper of the Government House, in the city of Montreal, entered the said asylum, and became an inmate thereof; that she understood that the said Maria had, for many years, led the life of a stroller and prostitute; and that she received her into the asylum with the hope of effecting her reformation; that in the progress of her acquaintance with the character of the said Maria, she found it to be very uncertain, and grossly deceitful; but that she did, nevertheless, persevere in her efforts to reclaim her to the paths of virtue and morality.

And deponent further declared, that having been informed that the said Maria had held conversation with a man who had reached the yard of the asylum, by scaling the enclosures, she sent for the said Maria, and severely reprimanded her; pointing out, that her holding such communication was in direct violation of the rules of the institution, and did moreover indicate a disposition to relapse into her vicious courses; that the said Maria was not touched by the remonstrances addressed to her, but became more indecorous in her conduct every day; and that finally, deponent was compelled to dismiss her from the asylum. That the said Maria, before her dismissal, did appear discontented with her residence there; but that deponent would not consent to her withdrawal without the consent of the said Mrs. Monk, who was accordingly informed of her daughter's conduct, and of her desire to withdraw from the asylum.

And deponent further declared, that she had reason to believe, that the man with whom the said Maria communicated, during her stay at the asylum, was Louis Malo, Constable of the courts of the city of Montreal; having been so informed by the said Maria herself. And deponent further declared, that she had reason to believe that the said Maria was in a state of pregnancy at the time she entered the asylum. And deponent further declared, that the said Maria was dismissed from the said asylum about the beginning of the month of March, eighteen hundred and thirty-five; and withdrew, as this deponent had been informed, to her mother's house.

And deponent further declared, that she had read the pamphlet entitled "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk;" and that deponent was thereby informed, for the first time, that the said Maria had been at any time an inmate of a convent; that the said Maria, at the time she was in the Magdalen Asylum, did never pretend to deponent, or any one else, according to the information and belief of deponent, that she had been an inmate of the Hotel Dieu Convent, or of any other convent whatever; but that deponent always understood and believed that she had, for many years, led the life of a vagrant and disorderly person.

And deponent further declared, that she had reason to believe

that the name "Fougnee," mentioned in the said "Disclosures," is mis-spelt for Fournier; and that at the time the said Maria was at the asylum, Miss Hypolyte Fournier and Miss Clotilde Fournier, two sisters, were assistants to deponent in the management of the asylum, and that deponent believed them to be identical with the persons named in the said "Disclosures" as the "two Miss Fougnees."

And deponent further declared, that she had reason to believe the person named "Miss Howard," in the said "Disclosures," to be identical with a person bearing that name who lived at the asylum contemporaneously with the said Maria.

And deponent further declared, that she had reason to believe, and therefore did believe, the person named "Jane McCoy," in the said "Disclosures," to be identical with a person bearing that name, who lived at the asylum contemporaneously with the said Maria.

And deponent further declared, that she had reason to believe, and did believe, the person named "Jane Ray" in the said "Disclosures," to be identical with a person bearing that name, who lived at the asylum contemporaneously with the said Maria.

And deponent further declared, that she had reason to believe, and did believe, the person designated in the said "Disclosures" as "one of my cousins, who lived at Lachinc, named Reed," to be identical with a person named Reed who lived at the asylum contemporaneously with the said Maria.

And deponent further declared, that many of the rules and habits of conventual life were in use and practice at the asylum at the time the said Maria was an inmate thereof; and that she had reason to believe, and did believe, that so much of the said "Disclosures" as related to conventual discipline, is an incorrect representation of what the said Maria saw and learned at the said asylum.

And deponent further declared, that she had reason to believe, and did believe, that the description given in the said "Disclosures," of the interior of the Hotel Dieu, is an incorrect description of the apartments of the said asylum, of which the said Maria was for some time an inmate, as is hereinbefore mentioned; and further deponent declared not. (Signed)

AGATHE HENRIETTE HUGUET LATOUR.

VE. D. C. McDONELL.

Sworn before me, this 27th day of
July, 1836.

(Signed)

ADAM L. MACNIDER, J. P.

This lady's name does not appear in the "Disclosures," and we regret to be compelled to intro-

duce it in connection with the nauseous criminality of Monk and her supporters.

The mention of the "two Misses Fougneés" occurs at page 34 of the "Disclosures."

No. 12. *Evidence of Miss Hypolyte Fournier.*

District of Montreal, Province of Lower Canada :

Hypolyte Fournier, spinster, being duly sworn, deposeth and saith, that she is acquainted with the contents of the pamphlet, entitled "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk;" that she hath reason to believe, and doth believe, the said Maria to be identical with a person bearing that name, who was an inmate of the institution commonly known as the Magdalen Asylum, of the city of Montreal, from the month of November eighteen hundred and thirty-four, to the month of March eighteen hundred and thirty-five: and that deponent hath reason to believe, and doth believe, the persons designated in the said "Disclosures" as "The two Miss Fougneés," to be identical with deponent and her sister Clotilde Fournier.

And deponent further saith, that she was an inmate of the said Asylum, as assistant to Mrs. McDonell, during the whole period of the stay of the said Maria therein, and that the acquaintance of deponent with the said Maria commenced and ended at the said Asylum.

And deponent further said, that she hath never understood, except from recent public report, that the said Maria had been at any time an inmate of any convent whatever, but that deponent hath always understood, that previously to her entrance into the said Asylum, the said Maria had led the life of a common stroller. And further deponent saith not.

HYPOLYTE FOURNIER.

Sworn before me, at Lachine,
this 30th day of July, 1835.

DOND. DUFT, J. P.

The younger sister of this lady is the "St. Clotilde" of the "Disclosures."

No. 13. *Evidence of Miss Clotilde Fournier.*

District of Montreal, Province of Lower Canada :

Clotilde Fournier, spinster, being duly sworn, deposeth and saith, that she is acquainted with the contents of the pamphlet entitled "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk," that she hath reason to believe, and doth believe, the said Maria to be identical with a person bearing that name, who was an inmate of the in-

stitution commonly known as the Magdalen Asylum of the city of Montreal, from the month of November eighteen hundred and thirty-four, to the month of March eighteen hundred and thirty-five, and that deponent hath reason to believe, and doth believe, the persons designated in the said "Disclosures" as the "two Miss Fougnees," to be identical with deponent and her sister Hypolyte Fournier.

And deponent further saith that she was an inmate of the said Asylum, as assistant to Mrs. McDonell, during the whole period of the stay of the said Maria therein, and that the acquaintance of deponent with the said Maria commenced and ended at the said Asylum.

And deponent further saith, that she hath never understood, except from recent public report, that the said Maria had been at any time an inmate of any convent whatever, but that deponent hath always understood that previously to her entrance into the said Asylum, the said Maria had led the life of a common stroller. And further, deponent saith not.

CLOTILDE FOURNIER.

Sworn before me, at Lachine, this
30th day of July, 1835.

DOND. DUFT J. P.

The evidence of both of these ladies is corroborated by the affidavit of Mrs. McDonell.

The deponent in the following affidavit, is the "Miss Howard" mentioned, in conjunction with the "two Miss Fougnees," as the "fellow-pupil" of Monk in the Congregational Nunnery, and her subsequent fellow-novice at the Hotel Dieu.

No.-14. *Evidence of Mary Ann Howard.*

Province of Lower Canada, District of Montreal:

Before me, Adam L. Macnider, one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the District of Montreal, appeared Mary Ann Howard, who, after making oath on the Holy Evangelists, declared:

That the contents of the pamphlet entitled, "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk," had been communicated to her: that she had reason to believe, and did believe, the said "Maria Monk," to be identical with a person, bearing that name, who was an inmate of the institution commonly known as the Magdalen Asylum of the city of Montreal, from the month of November eighteen hundred and thirty-four, to the month of March eighteen hundred and thirty-five; that deponent had reason to believe, and did be-

lieve, the person designated as "Miss Howard from Vermont," in the said "Disclosures," to be identical with deponent.

And deponent further declared, that she was an inmate of the said Asylum during the entire period of the said Maria Monk's stay therein; and that her acquaintance with the said Maria commenced and ended at the said asylum.

And deponent further declared, that she had never been at any time an inmate of any convent whatever.

And deponent further declared, that the said Maria was in the habit of holding frequent conversations with deponent on the events of her life; that among other things she informed deponent of her residence at St. Denis and at Sorel, and also of sundry voyages to Quebec, performed by her; that she informed deponent of her state of pregnancy, and that she attributed her condition to Louis Malo, one of the Constables of the courts of Montreal; that she informed deponent that she had cohabited with the said Louis a short time previously to her entrance into the Asylum; and that she mentioned particularly that the said Louis had placed her in a tavern kept by Richard Ouston, at the corner of St. Joseph and Commissioner streets, where the said Louis frequently visited her; that she mentioned particularly that the said Louis visited her at the said tavern for illicit purposes, on the seventeenth day of October, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-five; such day being commonly known as the dark day.

And deponent further declared, that the said Maria communicated to deponent the conversation held by her with the said Louis, as described in Mrs. McDonell's affidavit; the contents of which deponent declared herself to be acquainted with; that the said Maria further informed deponent that the said Louis, at the time of the said conversation, gave to her a gold ring, and offered her many inducements to quit the asylum.

And deponent further declared, that the said Maria pretended to deponent that she had been confined in the summer of eighteen hundred and thirty-four, at the Bishop's Church in the city of Montreal; that she further pretended to deponent, that she was guilty of a sacrilege at the time of such confirmation, in having concealed at confession, a certain sin committed by her at a ball, which she, the said Maria, had attended.

And deponent further declared, that the said Maria, during her residence at the said Asylum, did never pretend to deponent, or to any other person, according to the information and belief of deponent, that she had been any time an inmate of a convent; but that deponent always understood, as well from the confessions of the said Maria as from other sources, that she had, previously to her entrance into the asylum, led the life of a stroller; and further deponent declared not.

(Signed) MARY ANN ^{her} HOWARD.

Sworn before me, this 27th day of July, 1837.
ADAM L. MACNIDER, J. P.

The deponent in the following affidavit is Jane McCoy, who, it is stated at page 36, sat "one time by a window" with Monk in the Hotel Dieu convent.

No. 15. *Evidence of Jane McCoy.*

District of Montreal, Province of Lower Canada:

Before me, Adam L. Macnider, one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the district of Montreal, appeared Jane McCoy, who, after making oath on the Holy Evangelists, declared,

That the contents of the pamphlet, entitled "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk," had been communicated to her; that she had reason to believe, and did believe, the said "Maria Monk" to be identical with a person bearing that name, who was an inmate of the institution commonly known as the Magdalen Asylum of the city of Montreal, from the month of November eighteen hundred and thirty-four, to the month of March eighteen hundred and thirty-five; that deponent had reason to believe, and did believe, the person designated as "Jane McCoy" in the said "Disclosures," to be identical with deponent.

And deponent further declared, that she was an inmate of the said Asylum during the entire period of the said Maria Monk's stay therein; and that her acquaintance with the said Maria commenced and ended at the said Asylum.

And deponent further declared, that she had never been at any time an inmate of any convent whatever.

And deponent further declared, that the said Maria was in the habit of holding frequent conversations with deponent on the events of her life—that among other things she informed deponent of her residence at St. Denis and at Sorel, and also of sundry voyages to Quebec, performed by her; that she informed deponent of her state of pregnancy, and that she attributed her condition to Louis Malo, one of the constables of the court, of Montreal; that she informed deponent that she had cohabited with the said Louis a short time previously to her entrance into the Asylum, and that she mentioned particularly that the said Louis had placed her in a tavern kept by Richard Ouston, at the corner of St. Joseph and Commissioner streets, where the said Louis frequently visited her; that she mentioned particularly that the said Louis visited her at the said tavern for illicit purposes on the seventeenth day of October one thousand eight hundred and thirty-five, such day being commonly known as the dark day.

And deponent further declared, that the said Maria communicated to deponent the conversation held by her with the said Louis, as described in Mrs. McDonell's affidavit, the contents of

which deponent declared herself to be acquainted with ; that the said Maria further informed deponent that the said Louis, at the time of the said conversation, gave to her a gold ring, and offered her many inducements to quit the Asylum.

And deponent further declared, that the said Maria pretended to deponent that she had been confirmed in the summer of eighteen hundred and thirty-four at the Bishop's Church in the city of Montreal ; that she further pretended to deponent that she was guilty of a sacrilege at the time of such confirmation, in having concealed at confession a certain sin committed by her.

And deponent further declared, that the said Maria, during her residence at the said Asylum, did never pretend to deponent, or to any other person, according to the information and belief of deponent, that she had been at any time an inmate of a convent ; but that deponent always understood as well from the confession of the said Maria as from other sources, that she had previously to her entrance into the Asylum led the life of a stroller ; and further deponent declared not.

JEAN MCKAY.

Sworn before me, this 27th day
of July, 1835.

ADAM L. MACNIDER, J. P.

The deponent in the following affidavit is Jane Ray, who occupies so conspicuous a place in the "Disclosures" as the freakish "old nun."

No. 16. *Evidence of Jane Ray.*

Province of Lower Canada, District of Montreal :

Before me, Adam L. Macnider, one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the District of Montreal, appeared Jane Ray, who, after making oath on the Holy Evangelists, declared :

That the contents of the pamphlet, entitled the "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk," had been communicated to her ; that she had reason to believe, and did believe, the said Maria Monk to be identical with a person bearing that name, who was an inmate of the institution commonly known as the Magdalen Asylum of the city of Montreal, from the month of November eighteen hundred and thirty-four, to the month of March eighteen hundred and thirty-five ; and that deponent had reason to believe, and did believe, that the person named "Jane Ray" in the said "Disclosures," to be identical with the deponent.

And deponent further declared, that she was an inmate of the said Asylum during the entire period of the said Maria Monk's stay therein ; and that her acquaintance with the said Maria commenced and ended at the said Asylum.

And deponent further declared, that she had never been, at any time heretofore, an inmate of any convent whatever.

And deponent further declared, that the conduct of the said Maria in the said Asylum, was extremely indecorous, and that her example was hurtful to the discipline of the institution; and further, that deponent always understood and believed, that the said Maria had led, previously to her entrance into the said Asylum, the life of a stroller and prostitute.

And deponent further declared, that during the stay of the said Maria at the Asylum, the said Maria did never pretend to deponent, or to any other person, according to the information and belief of deponent, that she had been at any time an inmate of a convent; and further deponent declared not.

JANE RAY.

Sworn before me, this 27th day of
July, 1836.

ADAM L. MACNIDER, J. P.

Poor, repentant, and, from Mrs. McDonell's account, sincerely reformed Jane Ray, has never been a nun, and has never seen one except in the streets. The tricks and practices attributed to her in the "Disclosures," are foreign to her present state, and are certainly not indulged in by her in the "dormitories," "passages," or "cellars" of the only retreat from the world she has ever known—the "Magdalen Asylum."

The deponent in the following affidavit is "one of my cousins" mentioned at page 48 of the "Disclosures."

No. 17. *Evidence of M. Reed.*

District of Montreal, Province of Lower Canada:

Margaret Reed, of the parish of the Saut au Recollet, in the said district, being duly sworn on the Holy Evangelists, deposeth and saith, that the contents of the pamphlet entitled "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk," have been communicated to her; that she hath reason to believe, and doth believe, the said Maria Monk to be identical with a person bearing that name, who was an inmate of the institution commonly known as the Magdalen Asylum of the city of Montreal, from the month of November eighteen hundred and thirty-four, to the month of March eight-

teen hundred and thirty-five; and that she hath reason to believe, and doth believe, the person designated in the said "Disclosures" as "one of my cousins who lived at Lachine, named Reed," to be identical with deponent.

And deponent further saith, that she was an inmate of the said Asylum during the entire period of the residence of the said Maria thereat.

And deponent further saith, that previously to meeting the said Maria at the said Asylum, she had formed a personal acquaintance with her at St. Denis; that deponent particularly knew of the residence of the said Maria in the family of Charles St. Germain, latter, of the said St. Denis; and that it is the information and belief of the deponent, that she was expelled from the said family on account of her dissolute practices.

And deponent further saith, that deponent hath never been at any time heretofore an inmate in any convent whatever.

And deponent further saith, that the said Maria hath never pretended to deponent, at any time, or to any other person or persons, according to the information and belief of deponent, that she had been at any time an inmate of a convent; but that deponent always understood, as well from the confessions of the said Maria as from other sources, that the said Maria had for several years led the life of a common stroller and prostitute; and further deponent saith not.

her
MARGARET † REED.
mark.

Sworn before me, at Montreal, this
30th of July, 1836.

P. LUKIN, J. P.

Miss Louise Bousquet, Miss Hypolit  Fournier and her sister, Mary Ann Howard, Jane McCoy, Jane Ray, and M. Reed, all separately and conclusively deny all knowledge of the pretended noviciate and nunship of Monk. They all deny the allegations concerning them, with the exception that they were acquainted with Maria Monk.

Independently of "nuns, and priests," there are altogether eight persons named in the "Disclosures" as witnesses to Monk's residence in the Hotel Dieu hospital and convent. Doctor Nelson is the eighth.

No. 18. *Evidence of Doctor Nelson.*

Montreal, 19th March, 1836.

SIR—In reply to your request, desiring me to read the "Disclosures" of Miss M. Monk, and to say whether I can corroborate any of the allegations therein contained, particularly that one which relates to "Dr. Nelson," permit me to say, that when I was the medical attendant of the Hotel Dieu hospital, and occasionally of the convent, which is the cloistered part of the establishment, I never once saw Miss Monk there; but, more than once, at her mother's request, I saw her at the Government House-keeper's apartments, which are those occupied by her mother. The description she gives in the "Disclosures" of having accompanied me, during my attendance on the sick, is therefore incorrect, and it is otherwise faulty as regards the record. On these occasions the physician is accompanied by one of the *Apothecresses*, a nun, for the purpose of rendering to him an account of the administration of the medicines previously ordered, to give such information as may be asked regarding the patients during his absence, and to receive his future directions; these last, and his prescriptions, he himself writes in the prescription-book at the bed-side; they are in the French Language, and all in my own hand-writing; therefore the assertion, "I frequently followed Doctor Nelson with pen, ink, and paper, and wrote down the prescriptions," is also altogether incorrect.

I am,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

"ROBT. NELSON."

(Signed)

Doctor Nelson knows Monk well, for he has often advised her on her malady; but he has never known her as a nun of the Hotel Dieu.

We have elsewhere repeatedly pointed out the gross errors of the "Disclosures," in regard to what is publicly known of the Montreal convent. We have said that Sister Bourgeois was no wise connected in the foundation of the Hotel Dieu, and that the habit of Sister Bourgeois is not the habit of the Hotel Dieu nuns. This is no secret in Canada, as will appear by the following extract from the Quebec Almanack for 1831:

No. 19. *Evidence on the Foundation of the Hotel Dieu.*

HOTEL DIEU OF MONTREAL,
Founded in the year 1644, for the Poor Sick.

Sister Mesiere, Superior since 1827.	
Professed Nuns,	36
Novices,	2
Postulantes,	3
	<hr/>
	41

Quebec Almanack, 1831.

Sister Bourgeois founded the Congregational Nunnery, and it is there, and not at the Hotel Dieu, that her memory is held in peculiar veneration. We again extract from the Quebec Almanack.

No. 20. *Evidence on the Foundation of the Congregation de Notre Dame.*

CONGREGATION DE NOTRE DAME A MONTREAL.

Sister St. Magdalen (Miss Huot) Superior since 1827.	
Professed Nuns,	81
Novices,	2
Postulantes,	5
	<hr/>
	88

Quebec Almanack, 1836.

These are small matters in themselves, but material when considered with reference to the identity of the informant of the authors of the "Disclosures" with an ex-nun of the Hotel Dieu.

At page 34 of the "Disclosures" it is stated that there were "forty novices" at the Hotel Dieu. Look at document marked No. 19! How many novices are there set down? Two. The truth is, that there is no secrecy observed in regard to the number of novices or of nuns. No secrecy could

be observed consistently with the laws of the province; and thus it happens that the Protestant editors of the official Almanack are perfectly well acquainted with the constituency of every convent in Lower Canada. Forty novices! We again quote from the Quebec Almanack, but for 1836.

No. 21. *Evidence on the number of novices at the Hotel Dieu.*

HOTEL DIEU OF MONTREAL

Founded by Madame de Bouillon in 1664, for the poor Sick.

Sister Lapailleur Devoisy, Superior since 1831

Professed Nuns,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34
Novices,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Postulantes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
										37

In 1831 there were two novices, and in 1836 we find one; and we can assert with great certainty, that at no time since the foundation of the hospital there have been forty, or any number approaching it.

The extracts from the Quebec Almanack also corroborate what we have already advanced, that the sisters of the Congregational Nunnery take the name of saints, but that the sisters of the Hotel Dieu never do. In the "Disclosures," with the exception of "Jane Ray," the nuns of the latter are always designated as "saints."

At page 179 *et aliunde*, it is insinuated, that "superiors," when they grow old, are regularly murdered, and the bloody exit of one in particular is plainly intimated. In the extracts from the almanack are the names of two superiors. The sister Meziere, mentioned in No. 19, was superior from

1827 to 1833. The sister Lapailleur Devoisy, mentioned in No. 21, was superior from 1821 to 1827, and was re-elected first in 1833, and again recently in June, 1836.

At page 33 it is asserted, that "about one hundred priests are connected with the seminary of Montreal." We again extract from the official Almanack.

No. 22. *Evidence on Montreal Seminary.*

SEMINARY OF MONTREAL.

Mr. Henry Roux, Superior.
 Mr. Joseph Quiblier, Vice Superior.
 Mr. James Rocque.
 Mr. Charles de Bellefeuille, } Missionaries to the Lake of Two
 Mr. Flavien Durocher, } Mountains.
 Mr. Anthelme Malard.
 Mr. Frs. Humbert.
 Mr. Jos. L. Melchier Sauvage.
 Mr. Lasni Hubert.
 Mr. Ant. Satin.
 Mr. John Bt. Roupe.
 Mr. John Richard.
 Mr. Nicholas Dufreine.
 Mr. Joseph Comte, Procureur.
 Mr. John Bt. St. Pierre.
 Mr. Francis Bonin.
 Mr. Patrick Phelan.
 Mr. Claudius Fay, faisant les fonctions curiales.
 Mr. John Claudius Leonard.
 Mr. James Arraud.

LESER SEMINARY.

Mr. John Bt. Bayle, Director.
 Mr. John Larkin,
 Mr. Germ Sery, } Professors.
 Mr. Romain Larre, }
 Mr. O'Reilly,
 Mr. Angus McDonell, }
 Mr. Frs. X. Desève, } Regents of
 Mr. D. Denis, } the
 Mr. John Bt. Dupuis, } Humanities.
 Mr. Plinquette, }
 Mr. Eus. Durocher, }

Twenty priests attached to the seminary proper, and nine professors and regents to the lesser seminary. The latter institution, commonly known as the college, is removed half a mile from the Montreal seminary.

The laws of Canada fix and determine the age at which the religious habit may be assumed.

No. 23. *Evidence on the age requisite for the Monastical Profession.*

"The tenth article of the Ordinance of Orleans had fixed the age at twenty-five years for males, and at twenty for females; but the Council of Trent having fixed the age for both sexes at sixteen years, the twenty-eighth article of the ordinance of Blois adopted the same rule, and it was followed, throughout the kingdom until the month of March, 1768. (Article on the Monastic profession. *Repertoire de Jurisprudence.*)

The requisite age is sixteen, but it rarely happens that the veil is taken before twenty. In the "Disclosures," mention is made of professed nuns fourteen years old. It is not stated at what age Monk took the veil.

No distinction is made in the "Disclosures" between novices and postulantes; it is even asserted, page 34, that novices "are called in French postulantes." Both are errors, one of the omission and one of the commission. See the extracts from the official Almanack marked Nos. 19, 20, and 21.

The laws of Canada interfere in the ceremony of vesting the religious habit.

No. 24. *Evidence on the Vesting of the Religious habit.*

"In all religious houses there shall be two registers, in order to inscribe therein the deeds of vesting, noviciate, and profession;

which registry shall be paged, and each page noted by the superior of the convent, to do which superiors shall be authorized by a capitulary act, to be inserted at the commencement of the said registers."

"All the deeds of vesting, noviciate and profession, shall be inscribed in the said registers in continuation, and without blanks, and the said deeds shall be signed in the said registers by the requisite persons, and at the time they are made, and in no case shall the said deeds be inscribed on loose leaves."

"In each of the said deeds shall be mentioned the name and surname, and the age of him or her who shall assume the religious habit, or who shall make profession; the names, qualities, and domicils of his or her father and mother; his or her birth-place, and the date of the deed, which shall be signed on the registers, as well by the superior as by him or her who shall assume the habit, or make profession, and also by the bishop or ecclesiastic who shall have performed the ceremony, and by two of the nearest relations or guardians who shall have assisted at it.

The said registers shall serve during five consecutive years, and shall be lodged at the *Greffé*."

(Super.)

In the "Disclosures," the public ceremony of vesting the individual, Monk, is described, but no mention is made of compliance with the requisitions of the law.

What remains?

CHAPTER IX

Documentary evidence, proving that the plan given in the "Awful Disclosures," of the interior of the Hotel Dieu, is in all respects different from the reality.

WE will not do the American public the injury of supposing that their eyes cannot be opened to truth. We are well aware that the mere circulation of such a book as the "Disclosures," must have created a description of public opinion prejudicial to the good name of the individuals and institutions who stand charged therein. We under-

stand that recently, persons from the United States have visited Montreal, on missions of inquiry into the truth of these charges. It is probable that persons who have taken so much trouble to verify absurd conclusions will for ever retain them. Circumstances do not help to correct or alter the organization of a fool's mind. This refutation is not addressed to such men ; still less is it addressed to men who, with sufficient ability to distinguish between truth and falsehood, have voluntarily, and for sinister purposes, embraced the cause of the latter. It is addressed to that great majority who know only of the contents of the pamphlet through the medium of conversation ; and who, unacquainted with the enormous inconsistencies of the narrative, have suffered themselves to be affected by general assertions of the nature of its contents.

Now we desire it to be generally known, that all the allegations of Monk and her supporters are distinctly met and refuted in this reply.

We have accepted the challenge of the "anti-papists" in the matter of the plan and composition of the cloisters of the Hotel Dieu ; not certainly as an absolute test of the truth or falsehood of the narrative ; for it is the prerogative, not of Calvinistic divines, but of Reason, to fix and determine such a test. We have, however, accepted the challenge as one test, and we proceed to lay before the public the result of the encounter.

The narrative of Monk, it will be recollected, contains a detailed description of what is termed the "interior of the Black Nunnery," and it is stated at page 74, that whenever that interior "shall be examined, and found to be materially different"

from the description, that then she, Maria Monk, "can claim no confidence of her readers."

On the 15th of July, 1836, the Hotel Dieu Nunnery was visited by five gentlemen, of whom three are clergymen, and two are laymen—two are Americans, two Canadians, and one a Scotchman; four are Protestants, and one is a Catholic. It would be impossible to imagine any thing more conclusive than their evidence.

No. 25. *Evidence of the Rev. W. Curry, Rev. G. W. Perkins, Rev. H. Esson, Benjamin Holmes, Esq. Justice of the Peace, and Mr. I. Jones.*

This may certify, that, being desirous of ascertaining the truth in regard to Maria Monk's printed plan and description of the Hotel Dieu, or Black Nunnery of this city, I did, a few weeks since, in company with N. B. Doucet and I. P. Lacroix, Esquires, and without sending any previous notice, visit said Nunnery, and with said map and description in hand, examine most minutely from the cellar to the roof, all that part of said building between the wall or St. Joseph street, and the wall running from the north side of the public chapel, (the top of the map being called north,) that fronts on St. Paul street to the extreme corner, from whence the passage to the Congregational Nunnery is laid down in said map; and I do most freely declare, that after a patient and protracted scrutiny of the walls, windows, closets, doors, cellars, rooms, and furniture of the same; after having examined with equal scrutiny all the hospitals, out-houses, gardens, vaults, &c. &c., with special reference not only to their appearance, but their relative position to each other, so as to be sure that nothing was overlooked; I was unable to discern any resemblance whatever between said building, in whole or part, and that portion of said map furnished by Maria Monk. The only resemblance being that between the outside walls, and the ground plan in said map, which, she says, was furnished by another hand. All the interior is unlike her plan in every respect; and in as much as most, if not all, of the partition walls are commenced in the cellar, and built of heavy stone, it is impossible, in the nature of the case, that the building should have been so altered as to make this discrepancy. For, to say nothing of the labor and expense and publicity of such a work, the walls and wood-work bear that appearance of age which cannot be counterfeited. When the nuns and the lady superior, to whom I was introduced, learnt the object of my visit,

they cheerfully opened every enclosure of every description; answered all inquiries promptly; and one of them assured me, that if they had had timely notice of my visit, a permit from the Bishop would have been obtained to give me immediate access to the whole of the cloistered department; and I was assured that as soon as he should return to the city, such permit should be had.

I furthermore certify, that having been informed that a permit having been obtained for a party to visit and examine said Hotel Dieu nunnery, and that I was requested to make one of the number; I did, on the 15th July, 1836, after the Rev. G. W. Perkins had been added to the number, go in company with said party, consisting of Rev. G. W. Perkins of the American Pres. church, Rev. H. Esson of the Scotch pres. church, Benj. Holmes, Esq. cashier of the Montreal Bank, Protestants, and J. Jones, publisher of L'Ami du Peuple, Roman Catholic, and commencing at the general hospital and chapel, I examined, in company with these gentlemen, all the remainder of the buildings and grounds of said Hotel Dieu and Nunnery, until we had repeatedly traversed every section of the same. We examined closely the walls, windows, doors, rooms, vaults, &c. &c., and compared the same with Maria Monk's printed plan and description of what she denominated the Black Nunnery; and I freely declare, that after the closest search, during which the lady superior and several nuns stood ready to lead in every direction and give every assistance, we were unable to discover the remotest resemblance between any part of said building and the plan or description of Maria Monk. I furthermore assert, that I do not believe it possible that any persons could have made these alterations in the building, that would have produced this discrepancy, without having torn down and re-built the nunnery from the roof to the ground. We examined the burial-plate, and the register of deaths, commencing with the foundation of the convent. We examined, also, the register in which are entered the names, ages, and dates of the taking the veil of each nun. To ascertain whether this was the real register, I called for the name of a nun with whom I had become acquainted about one year since, and was immediately referred to it. In this record, which was an old book, there were no erasures, no mutilations. We searched for the name of Maria Monk, and others mentioned in her book; no such names were there. In conclusion, I declare to all whom it may concern, that if Maria Monk has told the truth in her description of the interior of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal, I shall not be slow to believe that the nuns of Canada yet retain the power of working miracles with stone and mortar; and that Maria Monk possessed this accomplishment up to the moment of her arrival in St. Jean Baptists street, at the time of her escape. For, when she "stepped across the yard, unbarred the great gate, and was at liberty," she must have passed directly over, under, or through, at least

three high stone walls that would have discouraged a less adventurous lady.

(Signed) W. F. CURRY, Cor. Sec. of the Canada
Education and Home Miss. Society.

Montreal, July 18, 1836.

Having visited the nunnery in company with the Rev. Mr. Curry and other Protestant gentlemen, as stated in the preceding declaration, I do most fully agree to the statements therein contained. In every step of my progress through the building, I had the last edition of Maria Monk's work in my hand, and did not fail most carefully to compare it with the interior of the edifice. I hesitate not to say, that it was utterly impossible that a person at all acquainted with the internal plan of the nunnery could have drawn up the sketch or map given in her book; so thorough was our scrutiny, that no changes, if materially varying the interior, could have escaped our notice.

Montreal, July, 22, 1836.

(Signed) G. W. PERKINS,
Pastor of the Am. Pres. Ch.

I hereby certify, that, as stated in the above declarations, I accompanied the Rev. Messrs. Curry and Perkins, Benjamin Holmes, Esquire, cashier of the Montreal bank, and J. Jones, publisher of the L'Ami du Peuple newspaper of this city, on Friday, the 15th instant, throughout the course of a very minute and rigorous scrutiny of the whole extensive range of buildings forming the Hotel Dieu or Black Nunnery of this city, having been conducted through all the numerous divisions of the establishment, and having deliberately and carefully surveyed them in succession, comparing, at every stage of our progress, what we saw with the pretended plan of the said nunnery as exhibited in the last edition of Maria Monk's work; and I perfectly concur with the two reverend gentlemen above mentioned, in declaring my decided conviction that the said plan ascribed to Maria Monk is a palpable and complete fabrication, demonstrative of nothing but its author's total ignorance of said building.

(Signed) H. ESSON,
member of the Scotch Presbyterian Church,
St. Gabriel street, Montreal.

Montreal, July 23d, 1836.

I hereby certify, that on the 16th day of July instant, I accompanied to the Hotel Dieu, or Black Nunnery, the Rev. Mr. Curry, the Rev. Mr. Perkins, the Rev. Mr. Esson, and Mr. Jones, and was then and there present at the examination made and entered upon by those gentlemen, as stated in the foregoing certificates, the full tenor of which, their close investigation of the premises, and their comparing the same with Maria Monk's plan of the said buildings, I was witness to; and I have much pleasure in

bearing testimony to the cheerful and ready disposition of the lady superior, and the other ladies, in forwarding the inspection, and affording every information acquired by the two first-named Rev. gentlemen.

(Signed) BENJ. HOLMES, J. P.
Montreal, 23d July, 1836.

I hereby certify, that I visited the Hotel Dieu convent in company with the gentlemen whose names are hereinbefore affixed to their separate certificates. I declare that I entirely concur in the statements and conclusions they make; and I further declare, that the "veiled nuns' department," which, to all appearance, by the plan is located in the centre building of the convent, is in fact situated elsewhere.

Montreal, July, 23d, 1836.

J. JONES.

At the time of their visit, the preceding gentlemen used Hoisington and Trow's edition of the "Disclosures," which is provided with an engraved plan of the Hotel Dieu, of the nunnery grounds, and of "the veiled nuns' department." Nothing was omitted to give to the proceedings of the visitors the character and reality of sincere and conscientious investigation; and what has been the result? Read the certificates.

It would seem impossible for the advisers of Monk to construct a lie of ordinary verisimilitude. The engraved plan prefixed to their improved edition of the "Disclosures," is a manifest and impudent fabrication.

No. 26. *Evidence of J. Ostell, Esq. Architect.*

This is to certify, that the plan of the Hotel Dieu nunnery of Montreal, published in a book, entitled "Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk," having been submitted to me for my professional inspection, I have considered the said plan, and declare it to be my opinion, that, architecturally speaking, and with reference to the practice prevailing in Canada in the construction of buildings, it is impossible that the said plan should have any real existence, for the following reasons. The detailed plan presents

partition walls on the first and second stories, which have no correspondence with each other, commencing and ending on each separate story; whereas it is necessary that such walls should not only correspond with each other, but that they should commence in the cellar; also the second story plan shows a portion of building at one extremity, without any similar substructure in the lower stories; the form of the main building on the block plan exhibits considerable incongruity with that of the detailed plan, inasmuch as the two small wings forming the cross of the building bear a proportion on the one that is entirely lost sight of in the other. Further I hereby declare, after having made during the last month a careful inspection of a greater portion of the buildings of the Hotel Dieu nunnery, more particularly of the centre or main building, which is represented in the "Disclosures" as containing the veiled nuns' apartments, that the plans and descriptions there given are essentially false, and could not, in my opinion, have ever had any actual existence in connection with the above named building; and further, that the nuns' apartments or cloisters (to which I was not permitted to enter) are not situate in the centre building, but in that part of the structure extending towards St. Jean Baptiste street in the east wing on the said street.

Montreal, July 30th, 1836.

(Signed)

JOHN OSTELL,
Architect and Surveyor.

CHAPTER X.

Documents produced by the advisers of Monk in support of the truth of her Narrative.

In the month of March of the present year, the "Protestant Vindicator," a paper printed in the city of New-York, published one affidavit, one statement of an anonymous "female," and one certificate, favorable to the veracity of Maria Monk. That the "Awful Disclosures" may not be deprived of the benefit of them, the compositors have kindly consented to "set them up" and the pressmen to "work them off."

No. 27. *Affidavit of William Miller.*

"City and County of New-York, ss.

William Miller being duly sworn, doth say,—I knew Maria Monk when she was a child, and was acquainted with all her father's family. My father, Mr. Adam Miller, kept the government school at St. John's, Lower Canada, for some years. Captain Wm. Monk, Maria's father, lived in the garrison, a short distance from the village, and she attended the school with me for some months, probably as much as a year. Her four brothers also attended with us. Our families were on terms of intimacy, as my father had a high regard for Captain Monk; but the temper of his wife was such, even at that time, as to cause much trouble. Capt. Monk died very suddenly, as was reported, in consequence of being poisoned. Mrs. Monk was then keeper of the Government House in Montreal, and received a pension, which privilege she has since enjoyed. In the summer of 1832 I left Canada, and came to this city. In about a year afterward I visited Montreal, and on the day when the Governor reviewed the troops, I believe about the end of August, I called at the Government House, where I saw Mrs. Monk and several of the family. I inquired where Maria was, and she told me that she was in the nunnery. This fact I well remember, because the information gave me great pain, as I had unfavorable opinions of the nunneries. On reading the "Awful Disclosures," I at once knew she was the eloped nun, but was unable to find her until a few days since, when we recognised each other immediately. I give with pleasure my testimony in her favor, as she is among strangers, and exertions have been made against her. I declare my personal knowledge of many facts stated in her book, and my full belief in the truth of her story, which, shocking as it is, cannot appear incredible to those persons acquainted with Canada.

"WILLIAM MILLER.

Sworn before me, this
3d day of March, 1836.

"BENJAMIN D. K. CRAIG,
"Commissioner of Deeds, &c."

We recommend William Miller to repent. Whether Mrs. Monk really did tell him in 1833 that her daughter was in a nunnery, may remain for ever a personal question between them; but this is not the case with regard to the identity, to which he has sworn, of Mrs. Monk's late husband, and Maria Monk's late father, with the Captain William Monk mentioned in his affidavit. The evidence of Mar-

tel Paul (No. 6), and of Lawrence Kidd, Esq. (No. 8), states who Monk's father really was. He was not a "gentleman in the service," but held the post of Barrack-master at St. John's.

The "*Vindicator*" premises the publication of the anonymous statement, by insinuating that the name of the author is withheld "only from delicacy to a lady's feelings." The "delicacy" of the authors and circulators of the "Awful Disclosures!"

No. 28. *Anonymous Evidence.*

"I was born at Montreal, and resided there until within a few months, and where my friends still remain. I was educated among the Catholics, and have never separated myself from them.

"I knew Maria Monk when quite a child. We went to school together for about a year, as near as I can remember, to Mr. Workman, Sacrament-street, in Montreal. She is about one month younger than myself. We left that school at the same time, and entered the Congregational Nunnery nearly together. I could mention many things which I witnessed there, calculated to confirm some of her accounts.

"I know of the elopement of a priest named Leclerc, who was a confessor, with a nun sent from the Congregational Nunnery to teach in a village. They were brought back, after which she gave birth to an infant, and was again employed as a teacher.

"Children were often punished in the Congregational Nunnery by being made to stand with arms extended, to imitate Christ's posture on the cross; and when we found vermin in our soup, as was often the case, we were exhorted to overcome our repugnance to it, because Christ died for us. I have seen such belts as are mentioned in the 'Awful Disclosures,' as well as gags; but never saw them applied.

"Maria Monk left the Congregational Nunnery before I did, and became a novice in the Hotel Dieu. I remember her entrance into the latter very well, for we had a '*jour de conge*,' holiday, on that occasion.

"Some short time subsequently, after school-hours one afternoon, while in the school-room in the second story of the Congregational Nunnery, several of the girls standing near a window exclaimed, 'There is Maria Monk.' I sprang to the window to look, and saw her, with several other novices, in the yard of the Hotel Dieu, among the plants which grew there. She did not appear to notice us, but I perfectly recognized her.

"I have frequently visited the public hospital of the Hotel Dieu. It is the custom there for some of the nuns and novices to enter at three o'clock, P. M., in procession, with food and delicacies for the sick. I recollect some of my visits there by circumstances attending them. For instance, I was much struck, on several occasions, by the beauty of a young novice, whose slender, graceful form, and interesting appearance, distinguished her from the rest. On inquiry I learnt that her name was Dubois, or something like it, and the daughter of an old man who had removed from the country, and lived near the Place d'Armes. She was so generally admired for her beauty, that she was called 'la belle St. Francois'—St. Francis being the saint's name she had assumed in the convent.

"I frequently went to the hospital to see two of my particular friends who were novices: and subsequently to visit one who had a sore throat, and was sick for some weeks. I saw Maria Monk there many times, in the dress of a novice, employed in different ways; but we were never allowed to speak to each other.

"Towards the close of the winter of 1833-4, I visited the hospital of the Hotel Dieu very frequently, to see Miss Bourke, a friend of mine, although I was not permitted to speak with her. While there one day, at the hour of 'conge,' or 'collation,' which, as I before stated, was at three P. M., a procession of nuns and novices entered, and among the former I saw Maria Monk, with a black veil, &c. She perceived and recognized me; but put her finger upon her lips in token of silence; and knowing how rigidly the rules were enforced, I did not speak.

"A short time afterward I saw her again in the same place, and under similar circumstances.

"I can fix the year when this occurred, because I recollect that the nuns in the hospital stared at a red dress I wore that season; and I am certain about the time of year, because I left my galo-shoes at the door before I went in.

"The improper conduct of a priest was the cause of my leaving the Congregational Nunnery: for my brother saw him kissing a female one day while he was on a visit to me, and exclaimed—'O mon Dieu! what a place you are in!—If father does not take you out of it, I will, if I have to tear you away.'

"After the last sight I had of Maria Monk in the hospital, I never saw nor heard of her until after I had been for some time an inhabitant of New-York. I then saw an extract from 'Awful Disclosures,' published in a newspaper, when I was perfectly satisfied that she was the authoress, and again at liberty. I was unable for several weeks to find her residence, but at length visited the house when she was absent. Seeing an infant among a number of persons who were strangers to me, as those present will testify, I declared that it must be the child mentioned in her book, from the striking resemblance it bears to Father Phelan, whom I well know. This declaration has also been made by others.

"When Maria Monk entered, she passed across the room, without turning towards me; but I recognized her by her gait, and when she saw me she knew me at once. I have since spent many hours with her, and am entirely convinced of the truth of her story, especially as I knew many things before which tend to confirm the statements which she makes."

"It is superfluous," remarks the Vindicator, "to add any thing to the above testimony." For the comfort of the "lady," it is recommended that her future silence may render it "superfluous" to sift her testimony and the worth of it. She is known.

The previous certificate of "We the Subscribers," is a novel species of intellectual evidence. It will be seen that they not only accept the testimony of the "spontaneous William Miller" (No. 27) and of the "young married woman" (No. 28), but that they also, in the character of critics, pronounce on the *internal* testimony in favor of the "Disclosures." They may drink the cup of shame. Poor Crrs!

CHAPTER XI.

Proceedings of the associates in Canada, in the summer of 1835.

THE earliest instigator of Monk's fabrications appears to have been an individual named Hoyte. The moral character of this individual had suffered severely a short time previously to his encounter with Monk in New-York about the month of May.

We are glad to perceive by the following testimony, that although he may be a preacher, he is not a regular ordained minister of any Christian denomination.

No. 29. *Evidence of the Rev. M. Richey.*

To the Editor of the Morning Courier.

SIR,—Among the affidavits published in your paper of to-day, relating to Mr. Hoyte and Maria Monk, I observe a deposition by Mr. Goodenough, that when Mr. Hoyte, in the month of August last, put up at the Exchange Coffee-house, he was entered on the book as a *Methodist preacher, and Agent or Superintendent of Sunday Schools, &c.* It has, however, been ascertained, from an examination of the book referred to, that no official designation is appended in it to Mr. Hoyte's name. This discrepancy, Mr. Goodenough states, took place entirely through mistake, and he did not know that Mr. Hoyte was thus characterized in his affidavit till he saw it in print. But as a similar mistake has found its way into several of the depositions which have been elicited by this unhappy affair, I deem it incumbent upon me, as a regularly appointed Methodist minister of this city, to declare that Mr. Hoyte has never had any connexion with the Methodist society, either as a preacher or as an agent for Sunday Schools; and I would at the same time express my surprise and regret, that the *New-York Protestant Vindicator* should have taken up, and industriously circulated charges of so grave a nature against the priests and nuns of this city, derived from so polluted a source. From such a species of *vindication* no cause can receive either honor or credit. By giving this publicity, you will confer a favor on your's respectfully,

MATHEW RICHEY,
Wesleyan Minister.

Montreal, Nov. 16, 1835.

No. 30. *Correspondence on the character of W. K. Hoyte.*

To the Editor of the Morning Courier.

SIR—A respectable citizen of this city, connected with the American Presbyterian Society, informed me, a few days since, that Mr. Hoyte, who has figured so largely in the papers of late, had been connected with some charitable Society in this city, to distribute Bibles and Tracts in the Eastern Townships; but that his accounts have proved so unsatisfactory, that he had been removed from the situation. Now, why do not those persons, who are acquainted with Mr. Hoyte's character, come forward and expose him publicly? A.

Nov. 17.

To the Editor of the Morning Courier.

SIR,—Observing in your paper of yesterday, a communication ascribing silence to certain persons acquainted with the character

of Mr. W. K. Hoyte, who has lately figured so largely in the various prints of this city, and asking why they do not "publicly expose" that individual?

In reply, it is sufficient to say, that such has already been done where alone it was deemed *requisite*, (*i. e.* in the United States,) as will appear by reference to a report dated in April last, and which appeared in the *New-York Evangelist*, with a request that it would "be copied into the *Boston Recorder* and *Vermont Chronicle*." Your insertion of this note, will oblige, respectfully yours,

VERITAS.

Montreal, November 19, 1835.

No. 31. *Evidence of Committee on the character of W. K. Hoyte.*

From the New-York Evangelist of April last.

"Before dismissing the subject, the committee cannot but express their deep regret that Mr. Hoyte has not complied with their wishes as to the management and disposal of the books committed to his charge, nor to their repeated solicitations to keep his accounts in a clear and accurate manner. His conduct in this respect being any thing but satisfactory, they wish further to intimate to their friends in the United States, that the gentleman alluded to is no longer their agent, or in any way acting under their responsibility.

"THOMAS M'LAREN,
A. F. MARSHALL,
HENRY LYMAN, } Committee."

This is the man who accompanied Monk to Canada in August, 1835, and who had the impudence to offer himself to the notice of several honorable men, as an investigator of the truth of certain rumors concerning the priests and nuns, of which he himself was the Author! The wretch was scorned as he deserved. "Judge Turner" of Vermont, who foolishly countenanced him for a brief period, doubtless in consequence of having discovered his cohabitation with the pretended ex-nun, withdrew from his society.

No. 32. *Evidence of Catharine Conners and Mary McCaffrey.*

District of Montreal, Province of Lower Canada:

Before me, W. Robertson, one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the District of Montreal, appeared Catharine Conners of Montreal; she having made oath on the Holy Evangelists, to say the truth and nothing but the truth, declared and said what follows:

Towards the 19th of August last, two men and a woman came to the *Exchange Coffee-House*; their names were written in the book, one by the name of Judge Turner, and the other as Mr Hoyte; the name of the woman was not written in the book in which the names of travellers are written, because I was informed that they were taking a single room with two beds. Some time after another room was given to them for their accommodation; the woman passed for the wife of Mr. Hoyte.

The day following, when I was making the bed, I found the woman in tears. Having made the remark to her that her child was a very young traveller, she replied, that she had not the power to dispense with the journey, for they travelled on business of importance; she also said that she had never had a day of happiness since she left Montreal, which was four years, with Mr. Hoyte; she expressed a wish to go and see her father. She entreated me to try and procure secretly clothes for her, for Mr. Hoyte wished to dine with her in his own room, in which he was then taking care of the child. I gave her my shawl and bonnet, and conducted her secretly out by the street St. Pierre; she never returned, and left the child in the hands of Mr. Hoyte. She said that her husband was a Methodist preacher, and agent of the Sunday schools for Montreal, in which she had resided four months last winter; but she had not then been with him. When I returned to the room, Mr. Hoyte was still taking care of the child; he asked me if I had seen his lady; I said no. Upon this question he told me that the father of his lady was dead, that her mother yet lived in the suburbs of Quebec, and he asked me for all the clothes which I had given to wash for him, his lady and child; clothes the lady had taken from the only portmanteau which they had. Beyond that, I perceived nothing remarkable, except that Mr. Hoyte wished to conceal this woman, and to prevent her from going out. I heard the judge say to him, "now she is yours."

Sworn before me, the 2d day
of November, 1835. (Signed) W. ROBERTSON

Mary McCaffrey, also a chambermaid in the hotel of Mr. Goodenough, corroborates the preceding deposition.

(Signed) W. ROBERTSON

H. K. Hoyte, cannot suffer by the exposure of his cohabitation with Monk. He cannot suffer from the exposure of his familiarities with Monk, practised even in the presence of her mother.

No. 33. *Evidence of Mrs. Monk.*

On this day, the twenty-fourth day of October, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-five, before me, William Robertson, one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the district of Montreal, came and appeared Isabella Mills, of the city of Montreal, widow of the late William Monk, who declared that, wishing to guard the public against the deception which has lately been practised in Montreal by designing men, who have taken advantage of the occasional derangement of her daughter, to make scandalous accusations against the Priests and Nuns in Montreal, and afterwards to make her pass herself for a nun who had left the convent. And after having made oath on the Holy Evangelists, (to say the truth,) the said Isabella Mills declares and says, a man decently dressed (whom afterwards I knew to be W. K. Hoyte, stating himself to be a minister of New-York,) came to my house on or about the middle of August last, and inquired for one Mr. Mills; that Mr. Esson, a minister here, had told him I could give some information about that man; I replied that I knew no one of that name in Montreal, but that I had a brother of that name five miles out of town. He then told me that he had lately come to Montreal, with a young woman and child of five weeks old; that the woman had absconded from him at Goodenough's tavern, where they were lodging, and left him with the child; he gave me a description of the woman: I unfortunately discovered that the description answered my daughter, and the reflection that this stranger had called upon Mr. Esson, our pastor, and inquiring for my brother, I suspected that this was planned; I asked for the child, and said that I would place it in a nunnery; to that Mr. Hoyte started every objection, in abusive language, against the nuns. At last he consented to give me the child, provided I would give my writing that it should be presented when demanded. We left the house together, Mr. Hoyte requesting me to walk at a distance from him, as he was a gentleman. I followed him to Mr. Goodenough's hotel, and he directed me to room No. 17, and to demand the child; a servant maid gave it to me; Mr. Hoyte came up, and gave me the clothing. I came home with the child, and sent Mrs. Turbert, an old acquaintance, in search of my daughter; her deposition will be seen. The next day Mr. Hoyte came in with an elderly man, Dr. Judge Turner, decently dressed, whom he introduced to me as a Mr. Turner of

St. Alban's. They demanded to see the child, which I produced. Mr. Hoyte demanded if I had discovered the mother; I said not. She must be found, said he; she has taken away a shawl and a bonnet belonging to a servant girl at Goodenough's; he would not pay for them; she had cost him too much already; that his things were kept at the hotel on that account; being afraid that this might more deeply involve my daughter, I offered my own shawl to replace the one taken; Mr. Hoyte first took it, but afterwards returned it to me on my promise that I would pay for the shawl and bonnet. In the course of the day, Mrs. Tarbert found my daughter, but she would not come to my house; she sent the bonnet and shawl, which were returned to their owner, who had lent them to my daughter to assist her in procuring her escape from Mr. Hoyte at the hotel. Early on the afternoon of the same day, Mr. Hoyte came to my house with the same old man, wishing me to make all my efforts to find the girl, in the meantime speaking very bitterly against the Catholics, the Priests, and the Nuns; mentioning that my daughter had been in the nunnery, where she had been ill treated. I denied that my daughter had ever been in a nunnery; that when she was about eight years of age, she went to a day-school; at that time came in two other persons, whom Mr. Hoyte introduced; one was the Rev. Mr Brewster. I do not recollect the other reverence's name. They all requested me, in the most pressing terms, to try to make it out my daughter had been in the nunnery; and that she had some connexion with the priests of the seminary, of which nunneries and priests she spoke in the most outrageous terms; said that should I make that out, myself, my daughter, and child would be protected for life. I expected to get rid of their importunities, in relating the melancholy circumstances by which my daughter was frequently deranged in her head, and told them, that when, at the age of about seven years, she broke a slate pencil in her head; that since that time her mental faculties were deranged, and by times much more than at other times, but that she was far from being an idiot; that she could make the most ridiculous, but most plausible stories: and that as to the history that she had been in a nunnery, it was a fabrication, for she never was in a nunnery; that at any one time I wished to obtain a place in a nunnery for her, that I had employed the influence of Mrs. De Montenach, of Dr. Nelson, and of our pastor, the Rev. Mr. Eason, but without success. I told them notwithstanding I was a Protestant, and did not like the Roman Catholic religion—like all other respectable protestants, I held the priests of the seminary and the nuns of Montreal in veneration, as the most pious and charitable persons I ever knew. After many more solicitations to the same effect, three of them retired, but Mr. Hoyte remained, adding to the other solicitations; he was stopped, a person having rapped at the door: it was then candlelight. I opened the door, and I found Dr. McDonald, who told me that my daughter

ter Maria was at his house, in the most distressing situation ; that she wished him to come and make her peace with me ; I went with the doctor to his house in M'Gill street ; she came with me to near my house, but would not come in, notwithstanding I assured her that she would be kindly treated, and that I would give her her child ; she crossed the parade-ground, and I went into the house, and returned for her. Mr. Hoyte followed me. She was leaning on the west railing of the parade ; we went to her : Mr. Hoyte told her, my dear Mary, I am sorry you have treated yourself and me in this manner ; I hope you have not exposed what has passed between us ; nevertheless I will treat you the same as ever, and spoke to her in the most affectionate terms ; took her in his arms ; she at first spoke to him very cross, and refused to go with him, but at last consented and went with him, absolutely refusing to come to my house. Soon after, Mr. Hoyte came and demanded the child ; I gave it to him. Next morning Mr. Hoyte returned, and was more pressing than in his former solicitation, and requested me to say that my daughter had been in the nunnery : that should I say so, it would be better than one hundred pounds to me ; that I would be protected for life, and that I should leave Montreal, and that I would be better provided for elsewhere ; I answered that thousands of pounds would not induce me to perjure myself : then he got saucy and abusive to the utmost ; he said he came to Montreal to detect the infamy of the Priests and the Nuns ; that he could not leave my daughter destitute in the wide world as I had done ; afterwards said, No, she is not your daughter, she is too sensible for that, and went away. He was gone but a few minutes, when Mr. Doucet, an ancient magistrate in Montreal, came in. That gentleman told me that Mr. Goodenough had just now called upon him, and requested him to let me know that I had a daughter in Montreal ; that she had come in with a Mr. Hoyte and a child, and that she had left Mr. Hoyte and the child, but that she was still in Montreal, so as to enable me to look for her, and that I might prevent some mischief that was going on. Then I related to him partly what I have above said. When he was going, two other gentlemen came. I refused to give them any information at first, excepting that they were of the party that had so much agitated me for a few days ; but being informed by Mr. Doucet that he knew one of them, particularly Mr. Perkins, for a respectable citizen for a long time in Montreal, and the other, Mr. Curry, two ministers from the United States, that if they came to obtain some information about the distressing events she related to have occurred in her family, he thought it would do no harm, and I related it to them : they appeared to be afflicted with such a circumstance ; I have not seen them any more. I asked Mr. Doucet if the man Hoyte could not be put in jail ; he replied that he thought not, for what he knew of the business. Then I asked if the Priests were informed of what was going on ; he replied, yes, but they never take

up these things ; they allow their character to defend itself. A few days after, I heard that my daughter was at one Mr. Johnson's, a joiner, at Griffin Town, with Mr. Hoyte ; that he passed her for a nun that had escaped from the Hotel Dieu Nunnery. I went there two days successively with Mrs. Tarbert ; the first day Mrs. Johnson denied her, and said, that she was gone to New-York with Mr. Hoyte. As I was returning I met Mr. Hoyte on the wharf, and I reproached him for his conduct. I told him that my daughter had been denied to me at Johnson's, but that I would have a search warrant to have her when I returned ; he had really gone with my unfortunate daughter ; and I received from Mr. Johnson, his wife, and a number of persons in their house, the grossest abuse, mixed with texts of the Gospel, Mr. Johnson bringing a Bible for me to swear on. I retired more deeply afflicted than ever, and further sayeth not.

Sworn before me, this 24th of
October, 1835.

W. ROBERTSON, J. P.

We are informed that Mrs. Monk's evidence on the material question of her daughter's residence in the Hotel Dieu Convent has been disputed on some unimaginable ground of interest and secret influence. It is unnecessary to draw comparisons between Mrs. Monk and her unhappy daughter ; but we are bound to state, that in her situation in life Mrs. Monk is regarded and esteemed. Her good conduct and management at the government house has secured to her, for many years, a situation of trust, and will continue to secure to her a decent subsistence to the end of her days. The attempt made to bribe Mrs. Monk was repeated in regard to other persons. Miss Louise Bousquet of St. Denis, was induced to visit Montreal on a false inducement, which the parties were frightened from following up by an explanation of their real intentions. The evidence of Miss Bousquet (No. 5), refers to Ambrose Vigeant.

No. 34. *Evidence of Ambroise Vigeaut.**Province of Lower Canada :*

This twenty-sixth day of July, eighteen hundred and thirty-six, appeared before me, Benjamin Holmes, one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the District of Montreal, Ambroise Vigeaut, who, having been sworn on the Holy Evangelists, declared :

That deponent had attended a school kept by the so-called Maria Monk at St. Denis, for the space of about two months, in the year eighteen hundred and thirty-three ; that whilst deponent attended her school, she kept it at two different places ; first in the house of Michael Guertin, farmer, and subsequently in the house of Jean Baptiste Laflamme dit Timineur ; that previously to his attendance at said school, deponent had understood that the said Maria had resided at St. Denis and in the neighborhood for several months ; that subsequently to his departure from the said school, he had understood that the said Maria remained residing in and about St. Denis for several months ; and deponent further particularly declared that he saw the said Maria at St. Denis on the twenty-ninth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-four, being the day on which my lord the bishop of Tennesse there administered confirmation ; and deponent further declared, that in the summer of eighteen hundred and thirty-five, the said Maria, accompanied by a man whose name is unknown to deponent, came to the bar of Philip Lavoie, tavern keeper, residing in the mainstreet of the St. Lawrence suburbs, city of Montreal, where deponent was employed ; that the said Maria and the said man having conversed for a long time together, the said Maria requested deponent to write to Miss Louise Bousquet of St. Denis, and say to her on behalf of the said Maria, that the said Maria had two hundred pounds currency to give her, and that she invited her to come to town to receive them ; that at the second visit to deponent of the said Maria, accompanied as aforesaid, the said letter was written ; that the man who accompanied the said Maria was dressed in black cloth ; that some time thereafter the said Louise Bousquet called on deponent, and that deponent was only able to inform her that the said letter was written at the request of the said Maria ; and deponent further declared, that he had never understood that the said Maria had been an inmate of any convent or religious establishment in Canada ; and deponent further declared not.

AMBROISE VIGEAUT.

Sworn before me, at Montreal, this 26th
day of July, 1836.

BENJ. HOLMES, J. P.

The associates, defeated in their attempts to suborn witnesses, defeated in their expectation of

Protestant illiberality in Canada, departed from it.

The admirable, noble, and generous conduct of the Protestants of Lower Canada, in relation to these "Awful Disclosures," is an example to all nations and all communities. Each man pressed forward with his unsolicited testimony in the cause of insulted virtue; the press echoed the public voice, and in accents of deep and eloquent indignation, reprobated the unapproachable infamy of, "We, the Subscribers."

The act of accusation, brought by "We, the Subscribers," against the priests and nuns of Lower Canada, recalls the proceedings of the Gallican revolutionary assassins on the trial of Marie Antoinette. When that persecuted princess was charged before a fanatical tribunal with an impossible crime, she turned from the tigers to her fellow-creatures, and exclaimed, "I appeal to the hearts of mothers."

THE END.