

EVIDENCE · DEMONSTRATING THE
FALSEHOODS OF WILLIAM L. STONE ;
CONCERNING THE
HOTEL DIEU NUNNERY
OF
M O N T R E A L .

In the month of November, 1835, and during all the period since, the Roman Prelate of Montreal has been urged by the New York Protestant Association for an impartial and unrestricted examination of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery in that city. No notice whatever has been taken by him, or by any person duly authorized by him, of the public call thus made by the Committee of the New-York Protestant Association.

To determine the truth of the "Awful Disclosures," a Roman Priest of New-York, named Conroy, was expressly designated as an Agent of the Roman Prelate and Priests of Canada to trepan Maria Monk, and transfer her back to Montreal, to receive the punishment with which they menaced her for eloping from the Hotel Dieu Nunnery; and the payment of the counsel's fees was offered by the Committee, if Mr. Conroy would institute a civil and criminal suit against Maria Monk and her publishers. That offer also has constantly been disregarded.

Both those offers having been found nugatory, in March 1836, the following notice was issued, and has been promulgated throughout Canada, the United States, and Britain; and yet the Roman Prelate of Montreal, Jean Jacques Lartigue, and his Priests are "silent as death, and still as midnight."

CHALLENGE.

"The Roman Prelate and Priests of Montreal, Messrs. Conroy, Quarter, and Schneller of New York—Messrs. Fenwick and Byrne of Boston—Mr. Hughes of Philadelphia—the Arch Prelate of Baltimore, and his subordinate Priests—and Cardinal England of Charleston, with all other Roman Priests, and every Nun from Baffin's bay to the Gulf of Mexico, are hereby challenged to meet an investigation of the truth of Maria Monk's "Awful Disclosures," before an impartial assembly; over which shall preside seven Gentlemen, three to be selected by the Roman Priests, three by the Executive Committee of the N. Y. Protestant Association, and the seventh as Chairman, to be chosen by the other six.

An eligible place in New York shall be appointed, and the regulations for the decorum and order of the meetings, with all the other arrangements, shall be made by the above Gentlemen.

All communications upon this subject from any of the Roman Priests or Nuns, either individually or as delegates for their superiors, addressed to *The Corresponding Secretary of the New York Protestant Association*, No. 142, Nassau street, New York; will be promptly answered.

To that offer, no attention has been paid; and no answer has ever been given, by any person, either directly or indirectly, for one whole year.

In July 1836, some gentlemen who were avowed partizans of the Romish Priests, were permitted to take a *peep* at part of the Nunnery; but their contradictory statements only confirmed the truth of Maria Monk's narrative. In October 1836, Mr. William L. Stone, Editor of the New York Commercial Advertiser, published a narrative of his visit to the Hotel Dieu Nunnery; but his *positive misrepresentations* still more powerfully strengthened Maria Monk's testimony. Among other offers which have been made to him, the following admitted of the easiest scrutiny, and was altogether decisive of the whole controversy.

Mr. Stone's statements disproved.

We offer Mr. Stone his choice of the following propositions:

1. Mr. Macdonnell, the Prelate of Upper Canada, does *not* allow the Papists to read the Bible, and does *not* distribute the Scriptures.

2. The Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal covers twenty times the space of ground, that the New York Bridewell occupies; and essential changes have been made within that building, and in the vaults beneath, and in the walls without, since August 1835; expressly to make a variation between its condition then, as described by Maria Monk, and its present apparent arrangement of rooms, staircases, dormitories, windows and doors.

3. There was a subterranean passage between the Seminary and the Hotel Dieu Convent.

4. Persons of all Classes in Montreal believe Maria Monk's "Awful Disclosures" in reference to the Priests and Nuns.

Those are four facts which we will demonstrate to be true, at any time, beyond all dispute, before any judicial authorities, or any other tribunal, civil or ecclesiastical.

To the preceding offer containing a flat contradiction of Mr. Stone's extraordinary misrepresentations, he has never replied; and although in private he has confessed his departures from the truth, in public he adheres to his *deceptions*.

It has, therefore been resolved to present to the Protestant brethren a compendious view of the evidence which already has been obtained; and by which the truth of Maria Monk's "Awful Disclosures," and the falsehood of Mr. Stone's narrative are incontestably demonstrated.

It is a matter of most portentous aspect, that Protestants should so sedulously endeavor to conceal the abhorrent qualities of that antichristian system of which the court of Rome is the head and heart. For it is most marvellous and worthy of remembrance, that since the allegations against the Roman priests and nuns of Montreal were first promulgated, none of the Popish confraternity have assumed the defence of their own characters or craft. By no mode can any of the principals, their accessories, their friends, or their agents, be induced to advance boldly, and before an impartial and equitable tribunal, permit the truth of the charges against them to be fairly examined. In all other cases that fact would be decisive.

Mr. Stone's account of his visit to the Hotel Dieu Convent of Montreal, exclusive of its incoherence, is the most indefinite detail which could be written. There is not one specific fact upon which a scrutiny or a comparison can be based. The length and breadth of the edifice are known by the official testimony of the Surveyor General of the Province.

A house 324 feet in front, by 468 in depth, and especially when the hospital department is considered, must necessarily include a very large number of separate apartments; and when we remember the character and course of conventual life, that such an edifice cannot be explored without much labor and time, is self-evident. Mr. Stone knows, that had he only mentioned *how many apartments he entered*, and especially in connection with the time which he and his party devoted to their survey, nothing more would have been necessary to seal his self-confutation.

Now it is proper to understand Mr. Stone's consistency; and the degree of credit which ought to be attached to any of his statements respecting this matter. Mr. Stone has formerly declared his unqualified belief of Maria Monk's "Awful Disclosures," from the following cause: He had a girl living in his family sometime ago, who was a Papist from Montreal—and that girl avowed to him her full conviction that Maria Monk's allegations were true, from her own knowledge of the facts.—That undesigned corroborative testimony was deemed incontrovertible. In conformity with that opinion, Mr. Stone published his own belief of Maria Monk's volume. Some short time after, when Mr. Jones, editor of *L'Ami du Peuple* of Montreal, returned from New York to that city, he propagated a report there, that the editor of the *Commercial Advertiser* was a believer in Maria Monk's narrative, and had come out publicly in her defence. The consequence was, that a few of the subscribers to the *New York Spectator* discontinued. The proprietors of the *Commercial Advertiser* have a considerable income from Canada for their paper; and therefore, when they became alarmed for their gains from that quarter, they retracted; and declared Maria Monk's volume, and all the other articles against the Jesuits and nuns of Montreal, "a humbug."—As if this contradictory manœuvre was not enough to nullify all their future assertions upon the subject; the scheme of Mr. Stone's visit to the nunnery was projected, expressly that the public might be deceived by his subsequent statements, which are promulgated for the sake of gain; because it is well known, and has been familiarly talked of at Montreal, that Mr. Stone, when he returned to New-York, would defend the priests and nuns. For if he did not, most of the subscribers to the *New-York Spectator* in Canada would withdraw their patronage.

There is not a well informed sincere Protestant in Montreal or Quebec, who will have the hardihood in his own name to come out boldly and maintain the purity and morality of the Roman priesthood in Canada; if there be any such men, let them advance to the warfare. We aver, that there is not a Scotch, English or American citizen of Montreal who has resided there twenty years, that does not implicitly believe all Maria Monk's narrative. Often have we heard many of them delineate the infanticides, murders and uncleanness of the Montreal Nunneries—and with unfeigned abhorrence, describe the awful turpitude which must necessarily be connected with the subterranean passage from the seminary to the nunneries. We also declare, that if any person had made inquiries respecting those subjects of any persons in Montreal anterior to the arrival of Maria Monk in that city in August 1835, all persons would have stated as notorious facts universally believed—that the *Hotel Dieu Nunnery* is a place of licentious resort for the Roman priests and other persons who are admitted in disguise as priests; and that the murder of infants and nuns is habitual in that edifice.

1. Mr. Stone says—"Father Richards was once a Methodist minister in Virginia, and proceeded to Montreal "to convert the Catholic clergy."

That is not true! Richards was a Popish priest or candidate for the priesthood in Maryland—but knowing what Mr. Stone is ignorant of, that no Roman priest can enter Canada in that character, without a license from the British Government, or the Provincial executive officer; Richards pretended to be a Methodist minister—and in that mask entered the province. His mock disputations with the Jesuits were merely a feint to conceal their mutual chicanery; until after a short period, he professed to be a convert to Romanism—and his Jesuistical trick was not discovered, until so long a time had elapsed, that it was not deemed necessary by the government forcibly to transport or eject him.

2. Mr. Stone says—the Jesuit Prelate of Upper Canada “allows his people to read the Bible, and he gives away all he can obtain for that object.” We deliberately pronounce the assertion to be a scandalous and notorious specimen of the Popish “all deceivableness of unrighteousness.” Mr. Stone knows that it is a mischievous falsehood, which is promulgated by him expressly to deceive the christian public, and to paralyze the efforts of those philanthropists who are anxious to diffuse the holy scriptures among the Canadian population who are destitute of the Bible.—Probably not seven Papists out of ten even know that such a book as the Bible exists.

3. Mr. Stone also asserts—“There have been no alterations either in the building within, or the vaults beneath, or the walls without.” In reply to this *startling* denial of the truth, it is only necessary to state the positive testimony of one of the workmen who assisted to make the alterations—and Mr. Curry himself has also admitted that fact.

4. Mr. Stone says—“There was no gate, and no passage way has been filled up.” We ourselves have seen with our own eyes that gate, and that passage way, which Maria Monk has described. And if they are not there now they have been “filled up.” Hence we retort Mr. Stone’s words—his “whole tale is one of falsehood.”

5. Mr. Stone declares—that “every nun has a key at her side, and can break their vow and retire if they please.” Here are two glaring falsehoods. Only the nuns who are in occasional superintendence have the key; and to break the conventual vows, by the laws of the monastic system, dooms the person to instant death; because the vows are irrevocable, and the act of attempting to infringe the vows and escape is the most unpardonable sacrilege in the Romish canon law!

6. Mr. Stone affirms of the subterranean passage between the Seminary and Convent—“No such passage was ever seen or heard of! No such passage exists.” In reply, it is only necessary to state—that passage we have seen, handled, and stood over it frequently in company with the Rev. Mr. Christmas, and others—and it is just as true to say that no such underground avenue did exist a short time ago, as it is to aver, that there is no such street as the Broadway in New York.

7. Mr. Stone also affirms, that no persons in Montreal, of any class, believe in Maria Monk’s “Awful Disclosures.” We pronounce this statement to be just as true, as the appalling deception concerning the subterranean passage. Who is it that does not believe? What do the Evangelical Christians in Montreal not believe? We therefore call upon that “city of sceptics,” as Mr. Stone names them, unequivocally to say, what they do not believe. Give us something tangible. We offer them one thing only from Mr. Stone’s statement. Will any Evangelical Christian deny the existence of the subterranean passage? Will any man of

character, or moral principle, or decorum, who resides in Montreal, attest—*no subterranean passage between the Seminary and Nunnery was ever seen or heard of!* That is Mr. Stone's declaration. What Protestant of Montreal will put his name to it? Will Mr. Perkins or Mr. Atkinson, or Mr. Wilks or Mr. Black, or Mr. Dewitt, or Mr. Savage, or Mr. Hedge, or Mr. Gregory, or Mr. Brewster, or Mr. Frothingham, or Mr. Fisher, or Mr. Lunn, or Mr. Venner, or Mr. Torrance, or Mr. Holmes, or Mr. Barrett, or Mr. Armour, or Dr. Nelson, or Dr. Robertson, or Mr. Muir, or Mr. Frazer, or anybody else, endorse Mr. Stone's note? NEVER.

Subterranean passage between the Seminary and the Hotel Dieu Nunnery in Montreal.

Mr. Jones, editor of the *L'Ami du Peuple* of Montreal, and Mr. Stone of New York his accomplice in deceiving the public, have both declared that "no subterranean passage between the Seminary and the Hotel Dieu Convent was ever seen or heard of!"

Greater publicity cannot be attached to any modern event in the history of Montreal, than the erection of the splendid Mass-house in that city. It was the work of years; but the subterranean passage was equally notorious, for near the corner of Joseph and Notre Dame streets, that passage was open to the inspection of all persons for a considerable time, and was seen by multitudes of residents and strangers.

1. *Evidence of the Boston Recorder.*

The Boston Recorder did, on the fifth of May 1826, publish an account of the subterranean passage from the Seminary to the Hotel Dieu Convent, with other matters respecting the Canadian Jesuits, of a similar purport to the recent developments. The article published in the Boston Recorder was copied into the Canadian papers, and raised a storm of indignation even greater than now exists!—That statement was censured as an injury to the character of the province abroad, and as such ought not to have been published, and the life of the person who sent it to Boston, was publicly threatened if he could have been discovered—but no man had the effrontery to deny the facts. Here then Mr. Jones of Montreal, and Mr. Stone of New York, are confuted by the Boston Recorder, by the Montreal Herald, in which the same article was reprinted, and by both the editors of those papers. The question is not—to what purpose the subterranean passage which crossed Joseph Street from the large Mass-house towards the Hotel Dieu Convent Garden, was applied? Where it led beyond the actual appearance, and for what objects it was dug out, walled up, and arched over, are not the topics of inquiry. The dispute is respecting its actual existence, visibility and notoriety, anterior to the month of October 1835, when the "Awful Disclosures" in reference to Canadian Popery were made? In the recent narrative of a visit to the Montreal Nunneries, it is expressly affirmed, "No such passage was ever seen or heard of." In addition to all the other evidence which has been adduced; in the Boston Recorder of November 11, 1836, are the following statements and remarks:

"We have looked over the file of the Recorder for 1826, from May to September inclusive. We find in the Recorder of May 5, 1826, a communication headed "Lower Canada." The writer of the article says:—

"In Montreal, a subterraneous pathway leads from the priests' residence to the two nunneries. At Three Rivers where the Jesuits' convent is on the opposite side of the street from the nunnery, a passage under the

street formed a communication between the *fraternity* and the *sisterhood*. Both those have been explored by the profane eyes of the heretics :—and it is most probable from analogy that the same private avenues exist, although yet undiscovered, in Quebec.”

Another correspondent who had spent ten years in Canada, says :

“That there is such a passage, leading from the Seminary to the Hotel Dieu, cannot be denied. But who is there can controvert the opinion, that this subterranean passage is not a common sewer? Who has explored it sufficiently to decide this?”

It is worthy of remembrance, that the latter writer sent his explanation merely to appease the storm, which the former delineations of Popery in Canada had excited. I have witnessed that gentleman himself laughing at the glaring contradictory nonsense, that a capacious passage of excellent mason work traversing the street *from* the river, is a sewer to drain nuisances *to* the river.

The Boston Recorder, adds—“*It is certain that the said passage had been heard of before the publication of the Awful Disclosures.*”

This infallible proof therefore decides the fact, that the existence of the subterranean passage from the Seminary to the Nunneries in Montreal, was a public, a notorious circumstance, prior to May 1826.

We proceed, however, to decide the point concerning the past and present existence of the subterranean avenue between the priests' habitation and the residence of the nuns in Montreal, by testimony which no one will attempt to invalidate.

2. Evidence of Rev. O. Wetmore.

The first witness is the Rev. Oliver Wetmore, of Utica. He thus remarked—

“Mr. Stone says: ‘No subterranean passage between the Hotel Dieu Nunnery at Montreal was ever seen or heard of!’ THAT IS NOT TRUE!

—When I travelled as a missionary in the northern parts of the state of New York, *thirty-three years ago*, I was frequently at the house of Judge Moers, who resided about a mile from the Canada line. That gentleman repeatedly talked with me respecting Popery in Montreal, which he had often visited. He spoke of the *subterranean passage between the Seminary and Nunneries*, as a matter of most public notoriety; and detailed the dissolute lives of the priests, their habitual gambling, intemperance, and profligacy, as well as the licentiousness of the female convents of Montreal; which Judge Moers said, were open matters of talk at that period, in that city, just as much as the most common affairs of life. Judge Moers also represented to me the priests and nuns of Montreal, from his personal acquaintance with them, exactly in the same light and character, *thirty-three years ago*, as they have lately been exhibited before the American public. *Mr. Stone, therefore, to my own certain knowledge, has published that which is not true!*”

Mr. Wetmore's testimony is of more value, when it is considered, that at the period to which that respected minister of the gospel refers, the present restrictions upon admission to the nunneries did not exist; and the Roman Priests were not obliged to be so concealed in their iniquitous transactions as the existing Protestant influence around them now renders indispensable.

3. Evidence of Mrs. Rourke.

A widow lady, Mrs. Rourke, now a member of the Methodist Episcopal church in New York; but who was formerly a Papist and a resident in

Montreal; states the following facts in reference to this subject; as combining her own personal knowledge of the case. "That in the year 1831, she was a resident of the city of Montreal, Lower Canada, and that at that time, the dissolute lives of the Roman priests, and their constant visits to the Hotel Dieu Nunnery for impure purposes, and also the killing of children in that Convent, were matters of familiar conversation and general belief among all people in that city with whom she used to associate, and especially among the Roman Catholic women.

She also further affirms—"That the existence of the subterranean passage between the Seminary and the Hotel Dieu Nunnery was known to all the Roman Catholics in that city—that the Roman priests often take women by it from the Seminary to that Nunnery—that she herself has gone from the Seminary to the Nunnery through the under-ground passage—and that Father Richards himself has conducted her from the Seminary through that under-ground passage to the Nunnery; for at that period she was a Roman Catholic—and that Maria Monk's description of that passage, the cellar, and the nunnery, so far as she was shown about it in the year 1831, by Father Richards, is truly and minutely accurate."

4. Evidence of the Rev. Mr. Wilkes.

The existence of that passage was a matter of common notoriety eight years ago. *Every old resident of Montreal to whom I have spoken on the subject, unites with me in the affirmation that the existence of that passage at that period was generally believed.* The general impression was unfavorable to the character of the Romish Priesthood and their sisterhood. Of the existence of that passage I have not a shadow of doubt. I was speaking the other day to an excellent man who distinctly recollects seeing it. It was a matter of the most common notoriety; as one said to me the other day—"Every one heard of that passage." *The denial of its existence is the novelty!*

They must be ignorant indeed of the leading facts of history who do not know what has resulted from Convents, the enforced celibacy of the Clergy, and the obligation on women as well as men to confess in secret to those priests the thoughts and intents of the heart. To talk of matters being different in Canada, to what they are in the other countries of Europe, is as preposterous as it would be to talk of human nature being different here from what it is there; or as it would be to affirm that Popery is not Popery.

HENRY WILKES.

5. Mr. Sprague's Statement.

As there is some excitement in the community upon the subject of Popish licentiousness and vice from the disclosures of Maria Monk, and as some affect to disbelieve and ridicule her work as totally false, being in possession of some evidence that will confirm her statements, I give the public the facts.

In conversation with a gentleman, who was some months since a Roman Catholic in Montreal, but has renounced their blasphemous dogmas, and is now a professed Christian, he told me, that he had been employed to labor in the cellars of the Priests' Seminary at Montreal, and while there engaged, he discovered a door in the wall of the cellar, which on opening, he found it connected with a passage under ground. He entered the passage, and passed through it until he came to some stairs, at the head of which was a trap door. From the direction and distance of the passage, he was perfectly certain that it must be a subterraneous communication between the

Seminary and the Convent. He further informed me that from the testimony of many females, his relatives not excepted, that at confession, the Priests were in the habit of asking the most licentious and revolting questions that could be propounded, not only to married ladies, but also to girls of 13 years.

Likewise from the habiliments of the Nuns and their appearance at times, he was wholly confirmed in the belief that their course in the Nunnery was any thing but virtuous. At the time of his making those disclosures Maria Monk had not written her book. I think testimony of this kind is powerfully corroborative, and that these things exist I fully believe.

E. SPRAGUE.

St. Albans, July, 1836.

6. Evidence of Mr. Miller.

Maria Monk has mentioned in her book something about the underground passage, which leads from the Black Nunnery to other places in Montreal. That fact I know by ocular demonstration, and which nine-tenths of the Canadians also will not deny, for it has been opened several times by the laborers who have been digging for the purpose of laying pipes to conduct gas and water. While preparing a place for the latter, I saw one of those passages, the earth being removed by the laborers, they struck upon the top of the passage, and curiosity led them to see what was beneath, for it sounded as though there was a hollow. They accordingly removed the large flat stones which formed the top of the passage. Many persons were looking on at the time, and several of them went down into it, when they returned after a few minutes, they stated that they went but a short distance, before they came to an intersection of passages, and were afraid to proceed further. Shortly after, several priests were on the spot; and prevented the people from further examining it; and had the place shut up immediately; while they stood by and guarded it until it was all done. The appearance of that part of the passage was the same as what I saw while they were laying the water pipes. The floor of it in both parts where I saw it was clean to appearance, with the exception of a little dirt that fell in on opening them, and of stone flagging. I have heard much about those underground passages in Montreal, in which place I have spent the most of my days. I give you my name and residence; and if you should be called upon from any quarter for the truth of this statement, I am ready to attest it upon oath; and there are others in this city, who also witnessed the same things.—The places where those openings were made in the underground passages, were in Joseph Street, for the water pipes; and for the gas pipes in Notre Dame Street, near Sacrament Street, at a short distance from the Seminary.

W. MILLER.

7. Evidence of Mr. Janes.

Mr. Janes, now of New London, Connecticut, resided several years in Montreal, and was a member of the American Presbyterian church, under the pastoral charge both of Mr. Christmas and Mr. Perkins. In walking from his store to the Post-Office, he generally passed by the large mass-house, and the premises of the convents. He also witnessed the whole progress of the building of that temple of idolatry pompously called the cathedral, from the digging for the foundation to its completion. He thinks that not less than *one hundred times*, he saw a subterranean passage, leading diagonally from the priests' Seminary, across Joseph street to the Hotel Dieu Nunnery, large enough for persons to pass

through it. When they were laying the foundation for the mass-house, it was apparent that the passage was arched. It excited much inquiry at that period respecting the origin and uses of that arched passage underground. The Roman priests taught their people to say—that the passage was designed for persons to go to the river Lawrence to fetch water, that they might be safe and out of the way of the Indians; and for that purpose it was made many years ago. But *there is a lie* branded on the very face of that story; for the direction of that passage would make the distance at least double the length of the straight course; for instead of leading directly down Joseph street towards the river, it crosses that street in a straight line from the Seminary to the Nunnery. In reply to that excuse for the existence of the passage, Mr. Janes asked them—‘as the Indians are now gone away from the country, why is that passage there *now*, and arched over?’ The answer which the followers of the Roman priests would give, was this—‘the ground is so soft in that spot, that they arched over the place fearing that the building might settle down!’ Mr. Janes also says, that the size of the building as stated in the American Protestant Vindicator, is accurately true, and that he can name hundreds of citizens of Montreal, who could testify to the truth of those facts.

Affidavit of Mr. Hogan.

New York, 26 October, 1836.

Thomas Hogan, of the city of New York, being duly affirmed, doth say,—that in the year 1824, he was a resident of the city of Montreal, Lower Canada; and that at that period, the existence of a subterranean passage between the Seminary in Notre Dame street, and the Hotel Dieu Convent, was a matter of the most public notoriety; and that he himself has been in that passage, having entered it from the door in the Seminary; and the said Hogan doth further depose, that to *his own personal knowledge*, the Roman priests were constantly in the practice of visiting the nuns for the purposes of licentious intercourse, by that secret passage.

THOMAS HOGAN.

Affirmed the twenty-sixth day of October, 1836—before me.

WM. H. BOGARDUS,
Commissioner of Deeds.

Thomas Hogan's Reply to William L. Stone.

William L. Stone contradicts my affidavit of October 26. He says that my affidavit “proves too much.” I know that fact, *it proves too much for the credit of his character and conduct.* However, what I have said is true! and no Roman priest in Montreal or New York, will venture to dispute its truth before my face, or under his own name will put me to the proof. Nor will Mr. Hall, the partner of Mr. Stone, venture to deny my statements, or call upon me to prove them according to our discipline. He is a Methodist as well as myself; and he knows how to make me speak truth, or to convict me of falsehood; and I hereby call upon him if he pleases to bring me to that Christian test.

As to the way by which I became acquainted with the abominable practices of Mr. Stone's dear friends and “agreeable travelling companions,” the Canadian Jesuits, that is of no importance. I have solemnly affirmed several facts, which no upright and intelligent man will contradict; for not one man in Canada believes Mr. Stone's fictions; and many Papists as well as Protestants, both in Canada and New-York, laugh at his impudence in attempting to impose upon the American churches—while all the Roman priests, both in the United States and in that Pro-

vince, so delight in his extravagant falsehoods, that it is proposed by one of the Popish papers of New York, to purchase "a handsome piece of plate to present to Colonel Stone, as a small token of Catholic gratitude for Protestant advocacy."

To my utter surprise, Mr. Stone continues boldly to repeat three things which are so notoriously untrue, that it seems scarcely possible to believe that his words are real.

1. Mr. Stone says, that "no alterations have been made in the Hotel Dieu Convent." Upon that subject he is totally wrong; for I have abundant testimony to prove that the inside of the house has been altered. As I know something about building, which Mr. Stone, notwithstanding his "iron pointed cane," is not acquainted with; if he will get permission for me and three companions to go into the house, I will show him where it has been altered. But my old acquaintances, the Roman Priests of Montreal, never will let me and my associates enter the apartments of the Nunnery.

2. Mr. Stone still denies the existence of the subterranean passage; he may as well deny the existence of Wall-street in New York. He says, that "the Cathedral is in the way;" but the contrary is the fact, for the passage runs close by the Cathedral, as multitudes of people in Montreal attest, not only Protestants but Papists. That the passage did exist in 1824, and is still used for the secrecy and facility of intercourse between the priests and nuns, is well known to all Montreal. That passage to my own personal knowledge, is also the way by which the priests led the nuns from the Convent, carried them to the Seminary, put on them priest's clothes, and in that disguise as priests, took the nuns to the priest's farm, and to Nun's Island. If Mr. Stone denies it, then it only shows that he is ignorant or a deceiver.

3. Mr. Stone also repeats his amazing contradictions about the size of the Nunnery. I am convinced that the mass-house alone, with the nuns' chapel adjoining, covers as much space as the New York Bridewell.—There cannot be two more plain and astonishing falsehoods than Mr. Stone asserts about the subterranean passage and the size of the convent. There is not one word of truth in his statement!

I therefore most solemnly affirm the truth of my former testimony; and from my own personal knowledge again declare, that the subterranean passage between the Seminary and Nunnery, was in existence in the year 1824; and that it was well known to many Papists in Montreal, to be constantly used for the most criminal purposes—and that there is no more truth in Mr. Stone's statement respecting the size of the Hotel Dieu Convent, than if he were to maintain, that a stout dray horse is no larger than a young suckling calf—and I am convinced that Mr. Hall knows my statement to be "the truth, and nothing but the truth."

THOMAS HOGAN.

Narrative by Rev. G. Bourne.

1. I most solemnly affirm, that the late Rev. Mr. Christmas conducted me in the year 1825, to visit the subterranean passage between the Seminary and the Hotel Dieu Convent; and that we frequently afterwards stood over that passage together. At other times, in company with different Christian brethren, I have also examined that under-ground avenue from the Seminary to the Nunnery; at least, that part of it which was open for common inspection for a considerable period, during the completion of the cathedral in that city.

2. I do most solemnly affirm, that an account of that passage, and of the priests and Romanism in Canada, was transmitted by a gentleman of Montreal, as he himself informed me, to the Boston Recorder, in the spring of the year 1826. That article, to my own certain knowledge, was published in the Boston Recorder, and copied into the Montreal papers. An excitement instantly was raised, and some of the Protestant preachers, the editors of newspapers, and other half Papists, then vilified and belied the supposed authors of that communication, the same as Jones and Stone and others are now doing; but none of them ventured then to deny the existence of the subterranean passage; for it was open to public inspection, and multitudes were constantly in the habit of beholding it, and discussing the infamous practices, which it was in every one's view palpably contrived to facilitate.

3. I do most solemnly affirm, that the Nunneries in Canada twelve years ago, and always subsequently, were represented to me as edifices, where the greatest licentiousness was constantly practised—that the cases of murder of Nuns and infanticides, were topics of conversation so familiar, that the abhorrent criminality of those revolting iniquities and the awful cruelties, from their notoriety and frequency of discussion, ceased to excite those indignant and melancholy emotions which they would otherwise have produced. That the unvarying dissoluteness of the Roman priests in Canada is just as open and general as the sunshine and the snow; their gambling, their intemperance, their criminal intercourse with females at their sacrament of marriage; and the infamy of their conduct to females at the Confession, and their having avowed children in the country parishes! And that all the statements made in the "Awful Disclosures" as general facts, and others, if possible, even more criminal, were the theme of common discourse, within my hearing, as undeniable realities, when as yet Maria Monk was a child, "alike unknowing and unknown."

4. I most solemnly affirm, that I have often heard in Montreal, Three Rivers, and Quebec, nearly all those kinds of atrocities detailed by the most respectable citizens and Christians, as the uniform course of life of the Roman priests and nuns in Lower Canada. That upon their authority, I did at various times in 1824, 1825, 1828, and 1829, in New York, Albany, Burlington, Plattsburg, and other places, narrate many facts similar to those in the "Awful Disclosures,"—that to many travellers on their tour for five years successively, whom I accompanied around Quebec to facilitate their inspection of its curiosities, I communicated those facts respecting the Roman priests, nuns, convents, and Popery—and that many years ago, and at subsequent periods, I have constantly detailed those circumstances to gentlemen, both clerical and of the laity, in New York, Philadelphia, Albany, New Haven, Boston, Hartford, and other places, and that they have invariably been confirmed by the testimony of Canadian visitors, several years before Maria Monk's escape from the Hotel Dieu Convent of Montreal.

For the truth of all the above statements, I am ready to adduce at any time and place multitudes of the most unexceptionable witnesses; in the presence of whom, not only an obdurate Papist, but even a conscience-seared Protestant, would hide his guilty person, and from whose glance he would strive to conceal his antichristian treacherous countenance!

GEORGE BOURNE.

Statement by Dr. Brownlee.

I can also give my testimony, that the facts alluded to in the preceding

statement, often, in my hearing, have been made the subject of common conversation among travellers and visitants from Quebec and Montreal; and that they detailed them as facts indubitably true; and that moreover, those details were publicly given forth long before I had heard the startling narrative of Maria Monk.

W. C. BROWNLEE.

More Disclosures respecting the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal, by the Rev. Messrs. Perkins and Curry.

At the time Messrs. Curry and Perkins, &c., visited the Hotel Dieu o Montreal, some time last summer, they found a well recently dug and stoned up. Mr. Curry is fully aware that it has been dug since February 1836, and also that the Roman priests have had two wells in the yard of the Nunnery ever since it has been known. Messrs. Curry and Perkins will not deny the above fact; for they themselves have stated it as above to several persons in Montreal. Why was that well dug at that particular time in the cellar of the Nunnery. That is the only well that was ever in the cellar. Yet, Mr. Stone would make the public believe, that it is of long standing, by saying that he saw an old iron pump in it. With regard to the passage connecting the Seminary with the Nunnery: It is nearly thirty years since I landed here, and many times have I heard that passage spoken of both by French and English; and I never heard a doubt expressed of its existence, till since Maria Monk's statement was laid before the public.

L. S.

The above letter is from one of the oldest Anglican residents of Montreal, who was intimately conversant with the interior of the Hotel Dieu Convent when it was partially open for general inspection; and who has watched the Jesuits that during 30 years have polluted, blinded, and cursed Lower Canada.

MARIA MONK AND COL. STONE.

"I have just returned from a sojourn of six weeks in Lower Canada, spent chiefly in the country adjacent to Montreal, and a part of the time in that city; and while there, I endeavored to form a correct judgment, for myself, on the controversy between Maria Monk, the professed ex-nun of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery, of Montreal, and Mr. Stone of New York.

The true state of the question, as it pends, between Wm. L. Stone, and Maria Monk, in her book of "Awful Disclosures," charges the popish bishop and priests connected with the Hotel Dieu Nunnery, of which she professes to have been an inmate, with crimes and conduct, which, if true, prove that that institution is a most iniquitous, impure, and demoralizing establishment; such an institution as ought not to be tolerated in any christian or enlightened country. On the other hand, Col. Stone having visited Montreal and the Convent, has volunteered his statement as testimony to prove that the priests, nuns and all connected with the institution, are pure, innocent and righteous persons, and the nunnery a most beneficial institution.

The facts set forth by Maria Monk, if true, prove that the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal, is, in its character and the uses made of it just what, every intelligent reader knows, from the most undoubted testimony, similar institutions have been for centuries past, wherever they have existed. These circumstances give no small weight to her testimony. If we consult Bower, Gavin, White, Baxter, and others, whose names might be given, their statements prove that the Hotel Dieu, is in no essential par-

ticular, different, so far as the character and conduct of those connected with it are concerned, from what its kindred establishments were in Europe in former times. More recently, even in our own country, many facts strongly corroborative of Miss Monk's statements, have been given to the public; and the persevering silence or refusal of the obstinate priests to the repeated calls, proposals, and challenges of respectable persons, for an examination of the buildings by a competent number of persons as witnesses, with Maria Monk as their guide. If the charges of Maria Monk were groundless, or if she never had been a Nun in that institution, as asserted by Col. Stone and the papists, nothing could have been easier than to have proved this by an actual examination, immediately upon the first application. This would have been conclusive and satisfactory. The refusal of the priests, to admit of such examination, is very strong presumptive evidence of their guilt and the truth of Miss Monk's charges. This presumption is increased by the fact that after sufficient time to make alterations in the building had elapsed, the papists invited certain individuals of their own choosing to make an examination; still refusing to permit an examination by persons not of their own selecting, or by persons in company with Maria Monk.

Mr. Clary the pastor of the Congregational society in that city, assured me, that on the same day, in July last, of the examination of the Hotel Dieu, by Messrs. Perkins, Curry, and others, under the guidance of Mr. Jones, the Catholic Editor of Montreal; he called on Mr. Jones and requested that permission might be obtained for several gentlemen, from New-York, with others from Montreal, to examine the Convent; that Mr. Jones at first said, he did not think the bishop would give such permission; but afterwards said that on certain conditions, he would engage to obtain permission for those gentlemen, with Maria Monk, to go in. One of those conditions was, that if the examination failed to prove the truth of Maria Monk's Disclosures, *she should be delivered up to the authorities that she might be dealt with as she deserved. With this condition Mr. C. became responsible for a compliance;* and Mr. J. engaged to see the bishop and let him know the next morning. Mr. J. not however complying with this engagement, Mr. C., after waiting two or three days, and hearing nothing from Mr. J., called on him again, when Mr. J. gave, as the cause of his non-compliance, that he had not seen the bishop, but promised to do so immediately, and to call on Mr. C. next morning between nine and ten o'clock, and seemed then quite confident permission would be granted. This interview was on Monday, and Mr. C. heard nothing further on the subject, until Saturday, when accidentally meeting Mr. J. in the Post Office: where he avowed to him that he could not obtain the bishop's permission, and assigned that as a reason why he had not fulfilled his promise. Thus, we have proof positive, that those interested in sustaining the character of the Convent, have refused to permit such an examination, as would incontestably settle the question, respecting the truth or falsehood of Maria Monk's charges.

I went to Montreal, wishing to obtain certain knowledge of the truth. There I first learned that Col. Stone had published a report of his examination of the Hotel Dieu, and when I heard of his conclusion, I was not a little surprised. I had read Messrs. Perkins' and Curry's report, which appeared to make but little impression against the credit of Maria Monk's Book. Before I had an opportunity of reading Col. Stone's account, I had a conversation with Messrs. Perkins and

Curry, American protestant ministers in Montreal, knowing that they advocated the innocency of the priests, and the purity of the nunnery. They expressed their belief that it was Mrs. McDonnell's Magdalen Asylum, that Maria Monk had in her mind's eye, when she wrote her description of the nunnery in which she was inclosed, and not the Hotel Dieu. This induced me to desire to see Mrs. McDonnell's establishment, and compare its appearance with Miss Monk's description and plan of the Hotel Dieu as represented in her book, and the drawing accompanying the late editions. I accordingly applied to Mrs. McDonnell for permission to take a view of her Asylum, which she readily granted. I visited this in company with the Rev. Mr. Clary. We found the house to be a very insignificant wooden building not affording sufficient height for two good stories; and not affording as many apartments as an ordinarily comfortable dwelling house, even in the country.

A particular description of the building would be unnecessary, as *there could scarcely have been another building selected in Montreal, having any pretensions to the name of a house, more unlike Maria Monk's description or plan, or more unlike the Hotel Dieu, than this.* It had no wall around it, but the very ordinary board fence which incloses Mrs. McDonnell's lot. We were conducted through the building, and assured we were shown the whole of it, which I do not doubt, by a girl called Jane Ray, one of the Magdalens, as we understood; but who was almost as dissimilar in appearance and manners to the Jane Ray so conspicuous in Maria Monk's book, as the Magdalen Asylum is unlike the Hotel Dieu. It was a matter of astonishment to us both, how respectable persons who had any regard for public opinion or their own discernment, could attempt to palm on the public, an idea so absurdly ridiculous, as that Maria Monk's description of the building which she calls the Hotel Dieu Nunnery is at all applicable to Mrs. McDonnell's asylum. Even our conductress seemed plainly to betray her want of faith in the pretended resemblance.

My next object was to ascertain whether the Hotel Dieu, and the other establishments described by Miss Monk, corresponded in any reasonable degree to her description of them. I neither sought nor desired an internal examination of any of them, for the purpose of testing the truth of Maria Monk's statement. It would be both idle and arrogant for any person however experienced, even in the art of building, to attempt to examine the interior of a building of such extent as the Hotel Dieu, with such a view at present, unless they had been formerly familiar with every part of it. If one moiety of the charges in Maria Monk's book be true, no rational person can doubt, but those concerned will endeavor to conceal the evidences of their guilt, by making every possible alteration in the building. It would weaken but little, the credit of Maria Monk's testimony, if she should, even now, be at a loss in recognizing the different apartments of the building, admitting she has been what she professes to have been, an inmate of the building. There has been ample time for making any alterations that could be effected by stone, plaster, and wood. An examination, immediately after the charges were made public, would have been satisfactory and conclusive on the one side or the other; but can now have but little weight in invalidating Miss Monk's testimony, if the interior of the building should not be found as represented by her.

After taking a view of the location of the principal *monastic establishments*, my attention was chiefly directed to the Hotel Dieu. This build-

ing according to Bouchette's typographical description of Lower Canada, published in 1815, extends in front of Paul st. 324 feet and in the depth on Joseph st. 468 feet. I presume the dimensions here given to be correct, judging merely by the eye. The building, yard and garden, occupy nearly the outer block of the lots, between Paul st. and Notre Dame, running parallel to it, and between Joseph and Jean Baptiste streets, running from Paul at right angles to Notre Dame. The whole front 324 feet on Paul st., is occupied by the main building, and three wings, in appearance not much inferior, in size to the main building, extending back towards Notre Dame street. It shows the absurdity of a stranger pretending to have thoroughly examined a building so extensive in the space of three hours or less, which Col. Stone professes to have done. I believe that none of those buildings, the front and back wings, is less than three stories above ground, and if my recollection does not greatly deceive me, the front is four story, as it faces on Paul st. But another reflection which the size of the building forces on the observer is, what can be the necessity or the use of such buildings for the accommodation of thirty-six nuns, and to accommodate the few sick which are there at any one time?

On looking over the New York Spectator of Oct. 17, I was utterly astonished to find that Col. Stone would venture the assertion which he has done. Col. Stone declares, "he would find only half his number of piles, and those not half so big. He would find no story below ground, and only two above." *The Col. is here so far from the truth, that if I had no other evidence, but his own, to prove that he had seen the Hotel Dieu, I should have better reason to believe that Col. Wm. L. Stone had never seen the Hotel Dieu, than I would to believe that Maria Monk had not been a nun in that establishment, and had not seen what she described as having taken place in it.* Because her account has some claims to credit, from the fact that the conduct which she has charged upon the priests and nuns, is very similar to what such persons in such establishments, have been often proved chargeable with in other countries. *But the Colonel's assertion would show to a person, who had seen the Hotel Dieu, that he had either forgotten the evidence of his own senses, or would not believe them.* I declare my solemn conviction, from all that I could see and learn in Montreal, that Col. Stone has wilfully and deliberately attempted to impose on his readers; and that his account of his visit to Montreal, does in no essential particular, diminish the credit otherwise due to Maria Monk's "*Awful Disclosures.*" For this opinion I offer the following reasons:

1. Col. Stone's report throughout gives evidence that it is intended as a mere production of the imagination, not a narrative of facts, or inferences founded on facts. This is evident to any person who has ever visited Montreal, or the surrounding country. The natural situation is indeed beautiful and grand, and this appears to be the only thing in the Col.'s description, in which he has not been unfaithful. "The neat white cottages every where clustering around the numerous parish churches," which he saw from the Mountain in Montreal, were all in his imagination. If the Col. had approached them near enough to take a *bona fide* view of them, he would have found his neat white cottages, every where dwindled into comfortless little log houses, having nothing whiter on them, in them, or about them, than the mortar that daubs the chinks between the logs. The habitations of the native Canadians, may be said to be any thing but neat, clean, and comfortable. A description so wide from the facts of the

case, show that the writer has something in view, different from that of conveying to his readers correct impressions.

2. Another reason for my opinion, is Col. Stone's declaration, "that the whole town and province, people of every and all denominations, men of intelligence and unquestioned piety, universally disbelieve Maria Monk's book." That for his own part, he could hear of but two believers in the Awful Disclosures in Montreal. "And one of these," he adds, "was evidently afraid to visit the nunnery, lest he should be forced by actual demonstration to change his opinion." The individual here referred to, the Rev. Mr. Clary, has repelled the Col.'s ungenerous insinuation, and properly rebuked him for his other mistatements.

But either the Col. must have been very partial in his inquiries, or a most uncommon change must have taken place in a very short time after he left Montreal, in the sentiments of the people. I was indeed told the same thing by the two clergymen friendly to the cause of the nunnery, to whom I applied for information. I was, however, then able to mention the names of some eight or ten, with some of whom they were acquainted, who had avowed to me their belief in the book. In my intercourse afterwards with the people, where opportunity permitted, I directed my inquiries to that point. *I found many, say twenty or more, a large portion of those with whom I conversed on the subject, avowed their unhesitating belief in the truth of the disclosures generally.* The evidences of their belief were drawn, indeed, from different sources. For instance, a respectable and intelligent merchant who had long been a resident of the city, in conversation on the subject, expressed some surprize, that the people of the States would give any credit to the statement of a person of such character as Maria Monk represented herself to have been. I stated my belief that but few of those, who credited her statements did it, on the *authority* of her word alone; but the character of such institutions in other times and other places; the natural tendency of such institutions, being contrary to the design of the Creator, and the uniform principles of human nature, corroborated the most essential parts of her statement. He immediately replied, that he did not doubt, indeed he had long been convinced, that those *institutions in Montreal were as corrupt as any of a similar kind had been in Europe, or elsewhere; and that in general, the character given of the Hotel Dieu was just enough.* "But," he added, "do not believe it on her testimony, for I do not consider her worthy to be admitted as a witness in the case." I alleged to him, that since he rejected her testimony, yet believed the things charged, he must have better evidence than hers, which influenced his belief—I must then consider him as strongly corroborating her statements, at least as to the true character of the institution. I mentioned to several of those persons that I had been told that I could not find any person in the city, who believed the things stated in Maria Monk's book. I was assured by them, that *they could take me to hundreds who believed them.* But they generally admitted that persons in business there did not wish to involve themselves in the controversy by expressing their opinion. The Roman Catholic interest in the city is so great, that it would be dangerous, and ruinous to persons in almost any kind of business, to take an open or public part against them. *The booksellers did not venture to keep the book for sale. One of them did get a few copies of them, with a view of keeping them on hand; but his friends under an apprehension that his property and person would be in danger prevailed with him to return them.* Those in Lower Canada who wish to examine the book and judge for themselves have to procure them privately.

3. A third reason for my opinion, is, Col. Stone's positive declaration, that no changes or alterations had been made, "either in the building within, the vaults beneath, or the walls without," and other things to the same amount.

But all the evidence which I obtained on this point, directly contradicts the Col.'s assertion. *I saw, myself, enough to rebut his testimony. The back wall, next and parallel to Notre Dame street, had a recent addition to its height of six or eight feet at least.* Though the mortar was sufficiently indurated, I doubt not, to have resisted all the force Colonel Stone would readily apply to it, with his iron pointed cane; yet *nothing could be more visible to the eye, than that it was of very recent construction.* I was assured, by a gentleman who was every day engaged in the store adjoining this piece of wall, and saw the repairs going on, that *there was also built, during the early part of the summer, an entire new wall, dividing the whole back ground,* which is one of the walls which Col. Stone asserts, "no unaided mortal, man or woman, could have surmounted." I was assured also, by the same person that *there was, during a part of the last winter, a pile of boards at least twenty-five feet in height, in the rear yard of the nunnery, which could not have been drawn away by a team, without his observing it, but that the pile gradually diminished, until the boards were all gone. From which he inferred they were wrought up, and used on the premises. And yet there was no exterior work on the premises, that could require so much material.* He took me to the position from which he viewed the works going on in the rear of the nunnery. There was no obstacle in his way of seeing what he professed to have seen, as his position overlooked the wall, high as it is. These facts, together with other evidence already before the public, and especially, the refusal so long to admit any person at all to examine the interior of the building, and after there had been ample time to make alterations, and to obliterate the evidence of such alterations; and then that only such persons should be admitted as were selected by the Priests themselves; the continued refusal to permit an examination under the guidance of Maria Monk; all confirm the opinion, that Col. Stone has attempted to impose upon his readers, and has been the dupe and tool of the Priests! They have engaged him to do what they would not have attempted to do themselves. Col. S. should have offered an explanation to show to the public the necessity of walls, "*some twenty feet high,*" as he has stated they are, to inclose a building otherwise fortified by massive iron doors and bolts, where the confinement, as he asserts, is altogether voluntarily.

4. Another circumstance is an additional reason for my solemn conviction that Col. Stone, with an intention to serve the Popish and anti-Protestant cause in the United States, has deliberately attempted to impose on his readers and to deceive the American public.

Col. Stone was wholly unqualified to form a judgment at all respecting the truth or falsehood of Maria Monk's description of the nunnery at the time he visited it; being altogether ignorant, even according to his own admission, of what her description was. He admits, that he had only taken "a cursory and occasional glance at a few of the pages" of M. Monk's book. How then could he without arrogance and presumption pretend to judge of the correctness of a book of several hundred pages—for the description runs through the whole book, having *only glanced in a cursory manner at a few of its pages?* The truth of the matter is this. When Col. Stone was reminded by the Rev. Mr. Clary at Montreal, of the loss which he

would sustain in his investigation from not having read the book—he then borrowed the book of Mr. Clary, and said he would make the most he could of his time until the hour of admission arrived. This was at 10 o'clock, A. M., and he was to commence his investigation at 1 P. M. Three hours to return to his lodgings, receive company, dine, and read a book of four hundred pages!

There are other things in Col. Stone's statement, which would greatly confirm the opinion above expressed. Such as the weakness of his apology for their refusal to submit to an examination at once, full and fair, and under such circumstances, that their report would be satisfactory to the public. The best one, he says, is that suggested to him by the nun—"that it would have interrupted them, &c." Why should one fair and impartial examination, be more annoying, than two which have already taken place? If Col. Stone's apology has any weight, why did the Papists themselves solicit Messrs. Perkins and Curry to visit it at all, and why so long after the charges had been published? Why submit to an examination by Col. Stone?

There is one other circumstance which I state on the authority of a highly respectable lady of Montreal, who travelled in company with Mr. and Mrs. Shepherd of Va., from Montreal to New York, who assured me that Mrs. Shepherd repeatedly expressed her conviction of the truth of the Awful Disclosures in general, after she visited the Convent in company with Col. Stone.

JAMES P. MILLER.

Argyle, November, 1836.

Alterations in the Hotel Dieu Nunnery.

A distinguished gentleman in Canada, who holds an office of importance under that government, and who has known the nunnery internal and external, for thirty-two years, says, the interior of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery has been so much altered within the last winter and spring, by means of masons and carpenters, that one would hardly know it from its interior, did he not know it from its exterior!

In addition to this, two gentlemen from Montreal, merchants, declared on October 12, 1836, in New York, that every family residing in the vicinity of the nunnery, do positively know and declare, from the stones, timber, and lime laid down, and carried into it, that alterations have been going on in the interior for nine or ten months past.

W. C. BROWNLEE.

Hotel Dieu Nunnery at Montreal.

"No alteration whatever has been made within the Hotel Dieu Nunnery since the time Maria Monk says she left that place."—Col. Stone.

This is one of the reckless assertions which this new advocate of the Jesuits and nuns of Montreal, has permitted himself to make in his narrative of his late investigations. Now, every reflecting man at all acquainted with this controversy, and the evidence of the case, is fully persuaded that Col. Stone has been completely "hoaxed" by the Montreal nuns and Jesuits.

A few days ago, a gentleman called on me, with whose brother, a resident of this city, I am acquainted. The gentleman is an architect at present residing in Montreal; an intelligent gentleman, of the highest reputation, and of unimpeachable veracity. The reason why we must withhold names is simply this:—There is a ferocious persecution set on foot in

Montreal, against all who have the honest courage to utter their free sentiments on the ghostly despots of that priest-ridden city ; or who openly avow that they cannot resist the overwhelming evidence of Maria Monk's narrative. I am willing to stand up as the guarantee of the honor and veracity of my friend ; and I trust the public will deem him and me as creditable witnesses, to say the least, as Col. Stone, or the notorious Mr. Jones of Montreal. But I cannot be induced to give the name of a friend to the ferocious editors of Montreal, and the daggers of priestly minions. Montreal must become a "Reformed" city, before we can give names, as we do in a decent Christian community. I need only point out the attack just made by Mr. Jones on the Rev. Mr. Clary, an amiable and unassuming minister of Jesus Christ in Montreal. That hired desperado does all but give the battle word—"On gallants and assassinate him!" We may peril our own lives here ; but, most assuredly, we have no right, and certainly no wish to peril the life of a good man, and the father of a family, in Montreal.

The points on which my friend gave me evidence were these.

1. His daughter, an amiable young lady, was a schoolmate of Maria Monk ; he and his wife also knew Maria Monk ; the intimacy was kept up between his daughter and M. Monk, after the latter was in "the Nunnery," and after she had taken the veil of the Novice! Miss _____, frequently, along with others, saw Maria Monk in the streets in the novice's habit ; and she, and he himself, and his wife, all knew personally the fact, that Maria Monk entered the Hotel Dieu Nunnery and took the nun's veil! This fact the gentleman stated in an explicit manner. Yet Col. Stone pronounces from the overwhelming influence of his seeing a certain dozen of rooms, out of some dozen score, more or less, that most truly, and of verity it doth appear, that Maria Monk never was even in the nunnery!

The evidence of that young lady fully corresponds with that of Mrs. Hahn, already published in the second edition of the Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk.

2. I drew his particular attention to "the alterations" that are said to have been made lately in the nunnery. He gave me the following answer. "It must be evident that Col. Stone has not lived in Montreal : it is perfectly evident that he was a transient visitant ; and not only so, but that he had, when there, put himself under the Bishop's party's guidance.—Every discreet man who professes to be a Protestant, and who thinks according to the evidence of his own eyes, must smile at the absolute silliness of that editor of your city. The very priests laugh at his weakness, and the facility of his being made a tool and a hoax-monger !

"I'll tell you what I saw with my own eyes, and what all my hands, to the number of some 20 persons saw, when we did our part of a lofty building, adjacent to the Hotel Dieu Nunnery. From our scaffoldings we had a complete view of the rear of the nunnery, from Notre Dame street. There we saw, during last May, June, and July, between 15 and 20 men busily employed within the nunnery's outer walls, carrying in timber, stones, and mortar. The work went on briskly for three months ; how much longer I do not profess to say. I do not say they began in May and stopped in July. But while at our work, we saw them briskly employed for that time. Now," continued he, "they reared and erected no building, on the outside, so far as any one of us could see. They carried their materials within the great building! And if fifteen or twenty men could

be so busy, during such a length of time, in the inside, and yet make no alterations, it is fairly beyond sober credence. I only state what we saw with our own eyes, and do testify on our honor."

3. I also put the usual question to him respecting the extent of the nunnery. "Sir," I said to him, "you are an architect: I ask you as one who can, by your eye, take a survey of a building and form a tolerably accurate idea of its extent: or perhaps you have stepped the front, what is the extent of that nunnery?" He replied, "Mons. Bouchette's dimensions quoted by you and Col. Stone, are unquestionably accurate. I am well acquainted with the size of that nunnery. I have lived near it twenty-one years. And I tell you, and you may tell the public, that the man who can take it on him to say, that he has fully explored all that immense building from garret to cellar, in about three hours, must have been either a fool, or a knave! I leave you to judge which, for I never saw Col. Stone, and know nothing of him."

I had much conversation with my friend, also, on the subterranean passage, and on the extent of credit given to Maria Monk in Montreal. As to the first, he was surprised that any man should ever question the underground passage; and he hesitated not to say, that had Col. Stone been a little with him, during his twenty-one years residence in Montreal, that gentleman never could, without a gross outrage offered to his conscience, have denied that secret way.

In reference to the last—the credit given to Maria Monk, he simply observed, that on the one hand, all who were under priestly influence, and all who feared for their trade and gains, professed to disbelieve the Awful Disclosures; while in private they would actually now tell nearly as bad stories about the wicked priests, which they all have heard from other creditable quarters. On the other hand, true protestants, and those who boldly speak out their mind, fully believe Maria Monk. The latter, as of course I expected, he said, were the smallest number as yet.

In addition to those statements, I may add, what a distinguished lady, one of a party recently from a visit to the nunnery, detailed in the presence of the family where she was then on a visit. "In visiting the apartments of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery, we reached," said she, "what seemed to be the end and termination of that building, or wing. But my son, not satisfied with this, began to examine. He at last discovered a key hole in the pannel work. Determined to explore, he placed his eye close to the key hole, and discovered what seemed to him, lighted apartments behind this wall; and the yellow fresh paint stuck on his brow and nose. This created much laughter; as it was with much difficulty that he could get it off."

Yet that far-famed Lord McDonald's man, with the steel pointed cane, carefully examined every wall, every chamber, every closet, from the garret to the cellar, and solemnly declares that no paint yielded to his cane; that there was no fresh paint to be seen or found; no alterations whatever!!!

We once more demand the answer before the American community—"How many rooms, chambers, closets, apartments, cellars, and trap doors, did you examine in the Hotel Dieu Nunnery, when you examined every room and apartment and cellar in it, as you have solemnly avowed before the Christian public?"

W. C. BROWNLEE.

Roman Priests of Montreal, and Mr. Jones, editor of L'Ami du Peuple.

"It was told personally by Jones, publisher in Montreal of the work just printed, "opposing Maria Monk's Disclosures," that he had not sold one copy to any of the Roman priests, and was truly exasperated. After an outlay of several hundred dollars and great exertion to get it up; he got into this province one thousand copies, expecting that the 300 regularly established priests would have each taken one, and circulated among their folks some few each!! But strange to say, only Protestants are buying them. Although a Catholic publisher, Jones is disgusted with the community with whom he is connected, and whom he was so ambitious of vindicating. To which it may be added, that said Jones has taken a small lot of vacant ground, on which he has recently built a shop only at his own expense, which he has leased at a ground rent of about one hundred and sixty dollars per annum. And to remove the impression circulating here, "that it is a gift from the clergy as a douceur for his zeal in getting out said 'Exposure of Maria Monk, &c.," he will exhibit the deed of lease from the "Seminary" for said term, and building, in his shop window shortly; for it is from the Superior of said Catholic Seminary, as representative of the Catholic priests, that he says it is leased. Jones is publicly circulating those statements in Montreal, thereby disgracing the conduct of the Roman priests."

T. A.

Popery in Canada.

Dr. ———, now residing at ———, recently unfolded his history in the following manner.

His father was a bigoted Papist, and dedicated him to the Romish priesthood. At the usual age he was sent to the Seminary at Montreal, to prepare for the Romish ecclesiastical functions. There he continued two years, and then abandoned the seminary, avowing that he would no longer reside there. He described the Roman priests of Montreal, from his own acquaintance with them during that initiatory period, as far more atrociously criminal, than any developments which have yet been made concerning them depict—confirmed all the statements concerning the subterranean passage, and the abominations of the convents—and emphatically said—"No language can display the wickedness of the Roman priests in Canada, and especially in the nunneries." He confirmed all the account of the infanticides, and the murder of nuns and priests, and added, "My father was so enraged at my withdrawal from the Seminary, and rejection of the priesthood, that he threatened to abandon and disinherit me—and even yet is not pacified, and is little more than civil towards me."

Evidence of Rev. Mr. Clary.

On the day of the examination of the convent, made in July last, under the guidance of Mr. Jones, the Catholic editor of this city, I made application to him for permission of a few gentlemen from New York, with others from this city, under the guidance of Maria Monk, to examine the convent, whose report I deemed the only one which would bring out the truth or satisfy the community. He seemed in favor of this proposal on the condition that if they failed to prove the truth of the Disclosures, its authors should be given up to the authorities to be at their disposal; and he promised to get permission, but the bishop would not grant it.

When Col. Stone was here, Mr. Jones, in presenting a request from

him to visit the convent, of his own accord included my name also, and afterwards came and informed me of it, giving as a reason, that I had complained that I could not get admittance there. I showed him in few words his mistake, and that it was not for myself but for others that I made application. His object by this offer seemed to be to make some compromise, or at least to silence my complaints that my request had not been granted. He appeared anxious that I should go in, remarking also, that he should expect me on coming out to give my opinion; and when he saw me disinclined under those circumstances to undertake an examination, he said Col. Stone was not going to examine but to visit the convent for his own gratification, and that I could do the same if I chose. I replied, that perhaps I would see Colonel Stone in the morning, and he left me.

Next morning I called on Col. Stone, and learned that his professed object was to examine the convent, "from garret to cellar," and he seemed rather desirous that I should go with him; he also said he had never read the Disclosures, but was inclined to disbelieve them. I stated some of my objections to going in, and was for a short time undecided as to what would be best; but after a little reflection and seeking wisdom from on high to direct me, I determined not to go—and my reasons were these: I was unwilling to take upon myself a responsibility which I deemed quite sufficient for such a committee as I had proposed, under the guidance of one who could and would point out the very things which ought to be seen and understood—such as the inaccuracies in the drawing—alterations in the building—changes of furniture—use of rooms, &c.; and the secret doors and apartments—and which would otherwise, of course, be carefully and artfully concealed. I had no wish to be one of a company to undertake such a work blindfolded, nor to do that which might deceive rather than enlighten the public mind, already, as I think, unnecessarily agitated by such examinations. As to being afraid that if I went in I should "have to change my opinion," as the Col. gratuitously asserts, he is as wide from the truth in that as in many other statements in his report. I told him plainly what my opinion was, has ever been, and still is, that the character given in the "Disclosures" of those establishments is substantially correct—and that too for other reasons than Maria Monk's testimony—and whether she was educated to tell the truth or not, there is to my mind in her Disclosures forcible evidence that she has related the things she has seen and known. I am neither alone, nor "one or two only," in Montreal who believe this. Had Col. Stone desired me, I would have introduced him to citizens—not a few—and those too of equal intelligence and respectability with any he saw, and long residents here, who are of the same opinion. And although his examination and report may gratify even a portion of the Protestant population here, they will be viewed by others as an entire deception. He said nothing about the recent building and repairing of stone walls within the inclosure of the convent, and which every body who wishes can see, nor the new wall within the building as mentioned privately by one of the former examiners—nor does he tell us that the well in the cellar was dug this summer, nor whether or not it is exactly in the same place that the cemetery, or hole for smothered nuns and infants is said to have been, nor whether the "piles of potatoes" in the cellar were always there, or were put there this season, nor what was under them. But "the great gloomy iron doors," and "the large jugs," it seems, are still to be seen.

It appears that such an examination is a mere burlesque. Why should Protestants, who believe that the Catholic church is the very "Mother of Harlots," undertake their defence, and not rather "come out of her, and not be partakers of her sins, that they receive not of her plagues?"

D. CLARY.

Evidence of an Episcopal Clergyman.

It is a common practice for nuns in Canada to go forth to the principal villages, for the purpose of teaching schools.

It is a general opinion among real Protestants, that Nunneries are scenes of much licentiousness.

Jones' book is a complete failure.

In Quebec the Episcopal clergy have suffered much persecution from foes without, and false brethren within, for the Christian manner in which they have set themselves in array against "the Beast." For some days after they had issued their circular, they were in absolute danger of their lives. One of them told me that the Papists were perfectly ferocious against them. How truly does that fact prove that the effects of the system of anti-christ are still the same as formerly. Indeed it requires but little connection and intercourse with Irish Papists to detect in them the self-same spirit that lighted up the fires of Smithfield!

L. C.

Evidence of Mr. Miller.

City and County of New York, ss.

William Miller, being duly sworn doth say,—I knew Maria Monk when she was quite 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 Capt. Monk; but the temper of his wife was such, even at that time, as to cause much trouble. Captain 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 afterwards 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 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 recognized 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.

Evidence of Mrs. Hahn.

The following statement has been furnished by Mrs. Hahn of Montreal :

"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, Sacramento 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 knew 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 with her 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, employe in different ways ; but we were never allowed to speak to each other.

"Towards the close of the winter 1833-4, I visited the hospital of the Hotel Dieu very frequently, to see Miss Bourke, a friend of mine, although I was not allowed to speak with her. While there one day, at the hour of '*conge*,' 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 afterwards, 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 an inhabitant for some time 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."

Questions to Mr. Curry, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Esson, Mr. Holmes, Mr. Frothingham, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Lyman.

In the accounts of your visit to the Hotel Dieu Convent, it is intimated that you saw every nook and corner of that nunnery high and low, from the garret to the cellar. As it is the universal belief in Canada, that no stranger, the Governor himself not excepted, would be admitted into the secret apartments of the nunnery, we wish you to tell us plainly all that you know concerning the following questions.

1. In what part of the cellar is it, and what is the kind of passage and steps which lead from the cellar into the nunnery garden—and what is the kind of aperture—and how is the partition opened—and in what part of the garden wall is the door or entrance from the cellar?

You must not reply that no such door "was ever seen or heard of,"—because in that case you will only prove that you have not seen or heard of all the parts of the nunnery.

2. In what part of the building is the Chaplain's room? And can you describe the private way from the Chaplain's apartments into the portion of the house, especially appropriated to the nuns—and with which of the rooms has the Chaplain's room a private communication?

Your denial that such a room and such a passage exist will not alter the reality; but will verify that there are ways about the nunnery, of which you never heard, and which you never most probably will see, until the dissolution of the monastic system, and the full and final overthrow of Popery in Canada.

3. What part of the Hotel Dieu Convent was occupied by Lester Taylor & Co., or Horatio Gates & Co., and Samuel Fitch & Co., in the year 1816, for the storage of two thousand barrels of flour? and what kinds of merchandize were stored in the same place at the time of your visit in the summer of 1836?

4. Were you permitted to pass through a very narrow alley from the Seminary into Paul street: a private avenue for the Roman priests alone, and for persons dressed as priests?

We shall not be put off with the fallacious statement—that no such places were “ever seen or heard of;” because the denial of men who know nothing upon the subject, will not be admitted either as relevant or valid.

Protestant Meeting in New York.

At a meeting convened in the American Tract Society's Rooms, at the call of several gentlemen, for the purpose of considering the controversy existing between Maria Monk and the Romish Priests of the Montreal Diocess, Francis D. Allen, Esq. was called to the chair, and the Rev. Octavius Winslow appointed as Secretary. The following Preamble and Resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, Maria Monk has hitherto appealed in vain to the Canadian authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, to bring her charges against the Romish priests of the Montreal Diocess, to some equitable tribunal for investigation; and whereas she now appeals to the people of the United States, invoking them to interpose in her behalf, and demand that justice be rendered to her, a lonely girl, in her peculiarly trying and unequal controversy with the priests of the Romish church; and whereas the people of the United States—besides being always disposed to listen to the voice of the friendless and the persecuted—have a deep and solemn interest in the matter in dispute, in consequence of the rapid increase of Popery and of popish institutions in their country; and also, in consequence of the contiguity of the Canadian Nunneries, and their intimate connexion with, and influence upon, the rising institutions of America:—
Therefore,

1. *Resolved*, That it is the sense of this meeting that the appeal of Maria Monk to the American people, ought to be promptly and efficiently responded to, so far as the nature of the case will admit of.

2. *Resolved*, That the conduct of the Romish Montreal priests and their advocates—in attempting, by every means, to asperse and vilify, the character of Maria Monk; and in attempting, through the most artful deceptions, to decoy her into their hands; and in refusing, for the space of one full year, to allow the matter in controversy to be brought to a fair trial; bespeaks any thing rather than manly honesty and virtuous innocence.

3. *Resolved*, That the recent examination, said to have been made, of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal, is altogether unsatisfactory; because the gentlemen engaged in it have been, from the beginning, *strongly and actively prejudiced* against Maria Monk. Mr Jones, editor of a Romish paper under the auspices of the priests, and principal mover in getting up the book against Maria Monk, which is about to appear, containing, among other things, the results of this party examination, was their leader. And because material alterations are said to have been made in and around the convent, during the past year—alterations, such as doubtless would easily deceive such a committee of examiners. For

these reasons, any report unfavorable to Maria Monk, made by these disqualified examiners, ought to have no influence in deciding this controversy.

4. *Resolved*, That the recent effort of the priests and their defenders, to make it appear that Maria Monk, instead of describing the Hotel Dieu Nunnery and its inmates, has described a place which they call a "Magdalen Asylum;" and also, their attempt to prove by the affidavits of some unprincipled profligates and infidels, calling themselves protestants, and of ignorant papists, that she never was a veiled nun; but that she has been of a bad character, living in brothels, &c.; is highly characteristic of Jesuitism; adapted to blind and bewilder the public mind, and turn it away from the single point to which it ought to be directed, *an impartial examination of the Convent*.

5. *Resolved*, That the demand made and reiterated by Maria Monk, during the space of a full year, that herself in person, accompanied by her friends as well as enemies, should be permitted to explore the Nunnery, is perfectly reasonable and right; and that a further refusal, in the present state of the case, forthwith to comply with it, on the part of the Hotel Dieu Ecclesiastics, *ought to be considered as equivalent to an acknowledgment of the crimes alleged against them by Maria Monk*.

6. *Resolved*, That a committee of four gentlemen be now appointed, with power to fill vacancies and increase their number, either in the United States or in Canada, to accompany Maria Monk to Montreal, so soon as the authorities of Canada shall afford suitable protection to such a committee, and shall grant them the necessary permission and facilities for thoroughly exploring the Hotel Dieu Nunnery, and such other establishments as are said to be connected with it, the Priests' Seminary, and the Congregational Nunnery, connected by subterranean passages; and also the Black Nun's Island, which seems to be a component part of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal; and that the following gentlemen be appointed on that committee—George Hall, Esq., late Mayor of Brooklyn, Professor S. F. B. Morse. David Wesson, Esq., and Rev. J. J. Slocum.

7. *Resolved*, That copies of the the above preamble and resolutions, signed by the Chairman and Secretary, be transmitted, one to His Majesty King William IV., one to the Governor of the Canadas, one to the Secretary of the Colonial department, one to the Romish Bishop of Montreal, and one to each of the papers of this city for publication; and also, that editors generally throughout the country, be respectfully requested to insert the same in their papers.

FRANCIS D. ALLEN, *Chairman*.

OCTAVIUS WINSLOW, *Sec'y*.

August 8, 1836.

Protestant Meeting in Philadelphia.

On 29th December, 1836, a meeting of the Friends of the Protestant Reformation was held. The resolutions which follow were passed without a dissenting voice.

Whereas it appears to be of importance to the cause of Protestantism, that Protestants generally should avow their opinions and judgment respecting the existing controversy with the Jesuits and Romanists in the United States. Therefore—having deliberated upon the circumstances connected with the recent contradictory developments concerning Popery

in Canada, which topic has become a theme of so much evident misrepresentation and calumniating reproach, the Protestants of Philadelphia hereby promulge their decision.

1. Resolved unanimously—That the ignorance or duplicity, and the easy credulity or the wilful delusions of all those nominal Protestants, who justify, defend or extenuate the anti-christian conduct and acts of Romish priests, nuns, the monastic system, and Popery, should sincerely be deplored, and should openly be condemned.

2. Resolved unanimously—That the resolute silence of the Romish Prelate and Priests of Montreal concerning the reiterated criminal allegations which for nearly fifteen months past have been published respecting themselves, is self-evident proof that they dare not confront their accusers and other witnesses, and is equivalent to a confession that *they are guilty*.

3. Resolved unanimously—That the stern and constant refusal of the Montreal Jesuit prelate to admit impartial persons to examine the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal, is convincing demonstration, that the Roman priests in Canada are conscious, that a minute examination of that institute would disclose the enormous iniquity which they are said to have perpetrated.

4. Resolved unanimously—That the conduct of the Rev. Mr. Curry of Montreal, the Rev. Mr. Chapin of Westhampton, and of the Editors of the New York Commercial Advertiser, in gratuitously appearing as advocates of the Jesuit Prelates and Priests in Canada, when at the same time those Romish ecclesiastics are too crafty to attempt any defence of themselves, immeritously calls for the unqualified censure of every true Protestant; and is a melancholy proof of that departure from the truth which must be lamented by every sincere christian.

5. Resolved unanimously—That the narratives and statements published by those gentlemen, Messrs. Curry, Chapin, and the Editors of the New York Commercial Advertiser, are not deserving the smallest credence; and cannot be believed by any person who has perused the controversy.

1. Because Mr. Curry has acknowledged that he himself has seen manifest recent alterations in the Hotel Dieu Nunnery.

2. Because from the time which elapsed while those gentlemen and their associates were avowedly examining the Nunnery, it is absolutely impossible that more than a very small part of the building could have been searched.

3. Because there are not only direct contradictions among the witnesses, but also because they confute themselves.

4. Because, so far as known to us, no one of all the gentlemen of Canada who have been named as collateral witnesses, has ventured to add his attestation to the assertions which Mr. Curry, Mr. Chapin, and Mr. Stone have made.

5. Because upon all the principal points in the controversy, it has been verified by the most incontrovertible testimony, that the statements which those gentlemen have made are not correct.

They have stated that the subterraneous passage between the Priests' Seminary and the Nunneries in Montreal, was never seen or heard of: which assertion has been proved to be a wilful falsehood, by numerous witnesses.

They have avowed, that the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal, is not

much larger than the New York Bridewell, which is notoriously untrue, by the official measurement of Mr. Bouchette, Surveyor General of Canada.

They have affirmed that no changes have recently been made in the Convent, notwithstanding the testimony of the very mechanics who executed the alterations, and of numerous witnesses who watched its progress.

They have also declared, that the Jesuit Priests in Canada actively aid in distributing the Scriptures, notwithstanding those Priests themselves disclaim that anti-canonical practice; and the Bible Society's reports for the last twenty years testify, that the Roman Priests in that Province always and universally prohibit the reading of the Scriptures; and in every case when it can be done with impunity, take away the word of God from its possessor, with the avowed purpose to destroy it.

6. Because it is a well known established rule of the Canadian Nunneries, that from certain parts of the buildings all strangers shall ever rigidly be excluded.

7. Because the narratives of those gentlemen are in direct contradiction to all the annals of the Roman hierarchy, and to the uniform history of Female Convents.

6. Resolved unanimously—That the proceedings of our Protestant Brethren in New York, in connection with the American Society to promote the principles of the Reformation, in reference to the controversy respecting Canadian Popery, are highly appreciated and cordially approved by the Protestants of Philadelphia. And it is earnestly recommended to our New York Brethren to carry on their warfare with the enemies of Protestantism, whether they are Popish undisguised enemies of the Cross of Christ, or whether they are nominal Protestants within the church or not. And especially not to desist from urging with all importunity their demand for an impartial and unrestricted research into the Hotel Dieu Convent, in company with those persons who were acquainted with it prior to the recent alterations, until by a deliberate and decisive exploration, the truth or the falsehood of the "Awful Disclosures" shall be definitively ascertained.

7. Whereas a variety of reports of most pernicious tendency are constantly circulated by the enemies of the truth, expressly to destroy the effect of the irresistible evidence which has been adduced against the Roman Priests and Nuns in the United States and Canada; and whereas it is of the highest importance that the mischiefs thence resulting should be promptly and efficiently counteracted, Therefore—

Resolved, That the preceding resolutions be transmitted to the Corresponding Secretary of the American Reformation Society, with our request that the New York Brethren will take our proceedings into consideration, and if they approve of our resolutions, add unto them their sanction.

Whereas our New York Brethren are the most competent witnesses in the case, they are also requested to publish their categorical decision on these three points: 1. The real authorship of the Book "entitled 'Awful Disclosures' respecting the Hotel Dieu Convent in Montreal." 2. The moral character and conduct of the Nun who made those "Awful Disclosures," since her residence in New York. 3. The degree of confidence which ought to be placed in her statements, arising from the unvarying consistency of her narrative amid the trying circumstances in which she has been placed.

A solemn declaration, at present, on those topics from our New York Brethren, will powerfully tend to dissipate falsehood and delusion, and to establish and confirm the minds of those persons who are yet incredulous and undecided.

LEWIS C. GUNN, *Secretary.*

Protestant Meeting in New York.

In compliance with the request of the Protestant Brethren of Philadelphia a general meeting of "the decided opponents of Popery" in New York was held according to previous notice, in Broadway Hall, on the 16th of January, 1837, for the objects specified in the preceding resolutions.

E. NEXSEN, Esq. was appointed **CHAIRMAN.**

W. CHAMBERS, **SECRETARY.**

Resolved unanimously, That the cordial thanks of this meeting be presented to our Protestant brethren of Philadelphia for the decisive tone in which they have avowed their judgment upon the existing controversy with Romanism in the United States; and they are hereby assured, that the Protestants of New York, now assembled, do most entirely approve of their resolutions, and after mature consideration, do add unto them our deliberate, full, and most solemn sanction.

The following part of the communication from the Protestants of Philadelphia was then presented to the meeting in a distinct form.

"Whereas our New York brethren are the most competent witnesses in the case, they are requested to publish their categorical decision on these three points. 1. The real authorship of the book entitled "Awful Disclosures" respecting the Hotel Dieu Convent in Montreal. 2 The character and conduct of the Nun who made those "Awful Disclosures," since her residence in New York. 3. The degree of confidence which ought to be placed in her statements, arising from the unvarying consistency of her narrative amid the trying circumstances in which she has been placed.

A solemn declaration, at present, on those topics from our New York brethren will powerfully tend to dissipate falsehood and delusion, and to establish and confirm the minds of those persons who are yet incredulous and undecided."

The above request having been read and considered; the following answer to that call from Philadelphia was unanimously adopted.

The Protestants of New York upon ample evidence do solemnly declare—

1. The volumes entitled "Awful Disclosures," and "Further Disclosures," were verbally communicated by Maria Monk, in all their most minute particulars and circumstances. Those narratives were written during the course of frequent conversations; and the books, as published, were transcribed and arranged from the original manuscripts, with the most scrupulous regard to accuracy and truth.

2. The conduct of Maria Monk during her residence in New York has procured for her many sincere friends, especially among the Ladies with whom she has resided; and her personal purity has powerfully corroborated the truth of her narrative.

3. No person who has heard her statements from herself can doubt her veracity in reference to the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal. Her consistency of detail has been verified by reiterated, searching, and prolonged examinations at distant intervals. The facts which she announ-

ced at one period were laid aside; and after the lapse of weeks and months, without any notice, inquiries were made of her respecting those subjects when she was unconscious of the design in introducing them. But the same answers were given often in the same words, and with the same circumstances, thereby demonstrating that the facts which she had revealed were entwined with her strongest recollections and the whole course of her prior life. This remarkable identity in her oft repeated narrative evinces, that confidence may be placed in her statements: 1. Because her charges against the Roman priests and nuns in Canada are among the things which could be most easily disproved by them, if they are false. 2. Because Maria Monk is comparatively uninformed upon the attributes and relations of domestic and civil society, and especially upon all affairs which have occurred exterior of the convent, either in the church or the world.

This meeting therefore do solemnly declare, as their unalterable conviction, that the more profoundly the testimony of Maria Monk respecting the Canadian Priests and Nuns is searched, the more lucid and irrefragable it appears; and also, that all the opposition has only hitherto rendered the truth of it more obvious.

Resolved unanimously, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the American Protestant Vindicator—and that all the Editors of Religious periodicals in the United States be requested to insert them in their respective miscellanies—that thereby anti-Protestant “falsehood and delusion” may be dissipated; and those of our Reformed Brethren who are yet “incredulous” concerning the true attributes of Popery, and the doings of the Jesuits may be enlightened and convinced; and those who are doubtful may be decided and confirmed.

E. NEX-EN, *Chairman.*
W. CHAMBERS, *Secretary.*

New York, January 16, 1837.

