

We have a suspicion that the feeling of the Auckland brethren on the death of the beloved and saintly old Father Walter was less correctly represented by the Grand Lodge than by the indignant Orangeman who writes in brief but blank amazement to the *Victorian Standard* of January 31 to protest against the resolution of condolence on the death of 'a priest.'

THE LODGE
AND
THE CATHOLIC
SCHOOLS.

It was, of course, to be expected that the same Grand Lodge would raise its voice in angry protest against Dean O'Reilly's request to the local Education Board for the inspection of Catholic schools. And—also of course,—the Lodge expressed no objection,

on principle or otherwise, to the inspection of private schools that are not Catholic. Its protest, briefly, was directed against the Board doing that which an Act of Parliament, in express terms, authorised and empowered them to do, and which is actually done at the present time by the great majority of Education Boards in the Colony. The protest of the scarved brethren was not made on grounds of public polity. It is simply part of the Orange Society's century-old campaign against the rights and liberties of the Catholic body. Orangemen carried on so violent and rebellious a campaign against Catholic Emancipation that the Society was suppressed by Act of Parliament in 1825. It was likewise suppressed eleven years later for the Cumberland Plot, which was a set attempt by the leaders of the organisation to prevent the accession of the Princess (now Queen) Victoria and to place on the throne in her stead their 'Imperial Grand Master,' the infamous Duke of Cumberland. To this day the Orange leaders, in their speeches and writings, deplore the passing of the Emancipation Act. Their 'accredited organ,' the *Victorian Standard*, referred to it as 'a fatal error' in its issue of May, 1893; and as recently as last November 5, a noted lodge chaplain in Toronto (reported in the *Toronto Sentinel* of December 21) denounced in flowing speech the repeal of the penal laws and the melancholy fact that 'Atheists, Jews, and Romanists are now permitted to share in the Government of the British Empire.' In Belfast, Derry, and Armagh—those strongholds of the fraternity—Catholics were systematically excluded from every public position of emolument and trust and deprived of many of the chief benefits of the Emancipation Act. At length the scandal reached such dimensions that the British Parliament was compelled a few years ago to protect to some extent the Catholic body in the three places mentioned by passing the Belfast Corporation Act, the Derry Improvement Act, and the Armagh Provisional Order, with the Healy clauses attached. All this was done amidst considerable uproar on the part of the lodges and with much fiery denunciation from their organs in the Press.

It is not generally known that every Orangeman, even on initiation to the first degree, takes an illegal and unconstitutional oath which, among other things, binds him to never vote for a Catholic at municipal or parliamentary elections. His oath likewise binds him to support members of the lodge, however disreputable their character may be, against decent Protestant candidates who are not members. This oath is made still more rigid during the blasphemous ceremonies and the coarse horse-play which the Orangeman has to pass through, almost quite naked, on initiation to the 'two-and-a-half' or 'purple arch' degree. Walking with or marrying a Catholic girl, attending a Catholic ceremony, presence at a bazaar or entertainment in aid of a Catholic institution or charity, are all matters for expulsion from the Order. And in the case of business men or employes of business firms expulsion generally carries with it a degree of great and petty persecution which makes forced severance from the Order a very serious penalty indeed. Members are constantly warned that any sort of dealings with Catholics is a violation of the bed-rock principle of the society. It is, in the eyes of the Order, a serious crime indeed for a member to purchase a ticket for a Catholic concert, for an Orange cyclist or athlete to compete at Catholic sports, for an Orange shopkeeper to exhibit in his shop windows the handbill or placard of a Catholic entertainment, or for any member of the fraternity to be intimately associated with an individual Catholic in any private or public enterprise. Mr. Lewis, a former chaplain of lodge 130 (Melbourne), sums up as follows the attitude of the ideal Orangeman towards Catholics, and the whole history of the organisation furnishes an overwhelmingly abundant justification of his words: 'The ideal Orangeman must wage a relentless and unscrupulous warfare against his Catholic fellow-citizens, giving no quarter or fair play, stopping at no injustice or even treachery to inflict a foul blow upon the character, business, or social position of any member of the hated creed.'

Our readers in Christchurch and district who are about to furnish are recommended to visit Messrs. Ballantyne and Company's furniture show rooms. Messrs. Ballantyne and Co. contend that a visit will demonstrate the fact that their prices are in accord with the highest standard of quality, and that no attempt is made at cheapness at the expense of excellence of material and work.—*.*

MARIA MONK.

THE FIRST SHAM NUN.

THE SHOCKING CAREER OF MRS. SLATTERY'S HEROINE.

In the course of a recent pamphlet on *Mrs. Slattery* we have given a brief history of the malodorous trade of sham nun. We showed that it was inaugurated by two creatures of immoral life who had never been members of the Church whose alleged enormities they professed to disclose. The male partner in this conspiracy of organised slander was a low *roue*. The inevitable female partner in the venture—one Maria Monk—was a thief, impostor, gaol-bird, and prostitute, who later on closed her evil career behind the iron doors of a Canadian prison. Like Maria Monk, the whole tribe of her unseavours imitators were, with two exceptions, non-Catholics and impostors. To this class Mrs. Slattery belongs. Our readers are quite safe in challenging her for independent proof that she was ever at any period of her life a Catholic. For our part, we hereby offer a substantial donation to any public charity in New Zealand if any of this itinerant impostor's friends can substantiate the statement that she ever was a Catholic.

Doctrinal differences and theological controversy will ever continue until the happy day when 'there shall be one Fold and one Shepherd.' But the use of the stench-pot is going out in controversy as it has long ago passed in physical warfare. The falsity of the monstrous story attributed to Maria Monk has been long ago so triumphantly demonstrated by Protestants and Catholics alike that no clean and sane controversialist would dream of having recourse to it nowadays. The noisome romance endures to this day for this chief or sole reason: that it appeals to the corrupt imagination of the lewd and prurient. No decent printer would set it up; no respectable publisher or bookseller would handle it; no decent family would allow it into their home. Nowadays it is supplied only in quarters in which more or less indecent publications are exposed for sale, and by chance roving impostors who appeal to the pruriency even more than to the bigotry of their hearers. It is being hawked about by the Slatterys and sold to swell the profits of their tour. All this is, of course, quite in keeping with their discreditable antecedents and with the loathsome character of their trade. Slattery—as we have shown by his own thrice-repeated confession—was imprisoned in Pittsburg for the sale of indecent literature. Mr Labouchere, M.P., editor of *Truth*, says of Slattery's lectures: 'It must be perfectly obvious to anyone with the slightest knowledge of the world that these lectures are delivered simply for the purpose of putting money into the lecturer's pocket, and that to gain his end the lecturer is appealing to pruriency and indecency under the guise of religion.' Of the ravings of the female impostor who accompanies Slattery. Mr Labouchere says: 'Decent women really ought to know better than to attend lectures to "ladies only" by "escaped nuns," whose appeals to the bigotry of their hearers are as notorious for their nastiness as for their mendacity.' But, then, decent women *do* know better: they don't attend such lectures.

There are few things that more forcibly illustrate the vile character of the Slattery crusade and the moral evils likely to result from it than the use they are making of the filthy publication entitled *The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk*. A fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind. And Mrs. Slattery belauds to the skies the sham-nun and fallen woman of Montreal, terms her 'the famous nun,' and dares to set her before the womanhood of New Zealand as a creature deserving of an altogether special measure of admiration. In the pamphlet already alluded to we have given (pp. 1-2) in brief and summary terms, the story of the unfortunate fallen woman who inaugurated the fraudulent profession of which Slattery's female companion and Margaret Shepherd are such bright particular adornments. What we have already written upon the subject was intended to furnish our readers with a brief and provisional reply to those who from levity or malice might fling Maria Monk at them in shop or factory or elsewhere. But the story deserves a more extended treatment at our hands, and for three principal reasons: (1) because it furnishes an amazing instance of the faith which roving impostors of this class repose in the gullibility of a low class of hearers to whose pruriency and bigotry a joint appeal is made: (2) because of the triumphant refutation of the story, on its first appearance, by prominent Protestants: (3) because during the Slattery tour in New Zealand the name of Maria Monk is likely to be flung at Catholic young men and women in shops, factories, etc., and the details of the refutation of the gross tale are by no means so well known to the man on the street as the story itself; (4) because a further examination of the facts of this notorious conspiracy of slander will serve to exhibit in a fuller light the degradation of those who would make use of it in a campaign which is nominally run in the Sacred Name of the God of Holiness and Truth, but the real object of which is to fob as much money, money, money as may be raked in at the monstrosity show rates of 'front seats one shilling, back seats sixpence.' It is no wonder that the *Western Mail* (South Wales) described Slattery a 'simply a mischief-maker of the most contemptible kind.'

MARIA'S TALE.

We shall now let Maria Monk (or, rather, the male conspirators whose tool she was) tell her tale. The contradictoriness and absurdity of vital portions of it will at once appear to the instructed Catholic reader. Non-Catholics who have patience to follow us will at the proper time come across large facts which will break up the savage tale of *Maria Monk* as if it had been struck by an earthquake. In the restricted space of a newspaper article it is impossible to give either the original story or its refutation with much detail. Briefly, the story attributed to Maria Monk runs as follows:—