

bulky thing which we call our 'Rogues' Gallery' and shall write sundry chapters of his biography—and, faith, we'll prent 'em.

*

Some weeks ago Nobbs (under his *alias*), bent on swindling in the name of the Lord, did some no-Popery whooping to his friends the Orangemen of Belfast. The brethren—whether there or in Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, Dunedin, or elsewhere—are not at all particular as to the moral character or antecedents of a roving adventurer so long as he (or she) throws road metal at the Man of Sin in a satisfactory way. They took Nobbs to their heart, for Nobbs has a tongue as coarse as a wood-rasp. But his visit to the head-centre of Orangeism led to an official declaration as to his character which ought to do good in some quarters. The *Dublin Freeman's Journal* of August 3 contains the following report of a question asked by Mr. Dillon in the House of Commons, and of the answer given by Mr. Wyndham, the Chief Secretary for Ireland:—

Mr. Dillon asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the man Widdows, who delivered a speech against Roman Catholics at the Belfast Custom House on Sunday, is the same Widdows who has been twice convicted for unnatural crimes; whether any prosecution has since been instituted against him for obtaining money under false pretences; whether any shorthand writers were present on behalf of the Government at Sunday's meeting; whether collections were taken up on the occasion; and whether it is intended to allow such proceedings to continue.

Mr. Wyndham.—It is true Widdows was convicted in London in 1888 of the offence referred to, and sentenced to 10 years' penal servitude. In July, 1875, he was convicted in Toronto of an attempt to commit a similar offence, and sentenced to five months' imprisonment. He has represented himself to be an ex-monk. He never was a monk or friar, and it is believed never was an ordained clergyman. No prosecution has as yet been instituted against him. The question whether any criminal proceedings can be taken is under consideration. No shorthand writer was present on the occasion mentioned, but notes in longhand of his remarks were taken.

Such be thy gods, O Israel!

That 'Jesuit Oath.'

It is a melancholy reflection on the secular journalism of Auckland that, at this hour of the day, editors should be found so credulous and so unacquainted with the course of current events as to give publication to the di-graceful forgery which has during the past few months won such malodorous notoriety under the title of the Jesuit oath. Some six months ago or thereabouts the Auckland *Hevald* dished up this frowsy old calumny. We at once switched the electric light on to it, and tracked it to its real author, Robert Ware, who held fast by Luther's motto, 'Against the Papacy we account all things lawful to us,' and who looked upon forgery as a fair and proper weapon with which to fight the battles of the Lord of Truth. Since the date of the publication of our refutation of this gross Jesuit myth, both secular and religious newspapers and periodicals in Great Britain have let the light of day upon Ware's forgery to such good purpose that none but malicious or sleepy-headed newspapers would give the outlawed Thing the hospitality of their columns. In all the circumstances, the publication of the 'Oath,' as a solid fact, in the *Auckland Star*, is an unpardonable offence against journalistic decency. The *Star* evidently entertains the conviction that it can abuse and spit upon its Catholic readers and advertisers with impunity; for the subsequent exposure of the forgery elicited from it no expression of apology or regret. We commend the manly protest of the local Catholic Literary Society. We think there is something stiffer than lemon-jelly or india-rubber in the spines of our Auckland friends, and we venture the hope that they will, so far as they are concerned, see that coarse attacks of this kind shall not be, commercially, a good speculation. There was long current a notion that the most sensitive portion of the human anatomy was the region of the epigastrium. The most sensitive spot in a newspaper proprietary is—its job.

An Apology.

In England this sham 'Jesuit Oath' has reached a new and interesting phase. One of the controversial fakirs of the press was allowed by the *Rochester and Chatham News* to accuse Eather Bernard Vaughan with having taken the now notorious 'Oath.' The result is told in the following editorial apology which appeared in its issue of August 3, and illustrates in a curious way the absolute lack of evidence on which press and platform enthusiasts, in England as in New Zealand, are prepared to lay abominable charges at the doors of their Catholic neighbors:—

'In our issue of July 6 we published a letter under the heading of "The Attack on the King," in which the writer, who signed himself "Loyal Protestant," asserted that Father Vaughan, brother of Cardinal Vaughan, had taken the "Jesuit Oath," which was quoted at length. One of the sen-

tences ran: "I do renounce and disown my allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or State-named Protestant, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers, etc." A few days after the publication of this letter, Messrs. Witham, Roskell, Munster, and Weld, of 1, Gray's Inn square, W.C., solicitors to the Rev. Bernard Vaughan, commenced an action for libel against us. We applied to the "Loyal Protestant" to furnish us with the evidence upon which he had made such a definite and emphatic statement, and our correspondent was then obliged to admit that he could procure none. He had seen the so-called "Jesuit Oath" in print somewhere, and assumed and took it for granted that, as the Rev. Father Bernard Vaughan is a member of the Society of Jesus, "he must have taken that oath." We then went carefully into the matter of the "Jesuit Oath" ourselves, and having come to the conclusion that the statement of "Loyal Protestant" is absolutely unfounded, and that the Jesuits take no such oath as that alleged, we felt in honor bound to express our regret that we had inadvertently allowed any such fraudulent imputation upon the loyalty and good faith of the Rev. Bernard Vaughan to appear in the columns of the *News*. Messrs. Witham, Roskell, Munster, and Weld, on behalf of the Rev. Bernard Vaughan, have accepted this explanation, and have acceded to our request to withdraw the action. This is fortunate for "Loyal Protestant" as well as for ourselves. In putting forward ridiculous inferences as positive facts, our correspondent abused the hospitality of our columns, and forfeited all claim to be sheltered from the consequences of his own act.'

A Pending Action.

Some time in the merry month of July—auspicious period!—the editor of the *Methodist Weekly* also adorned his religious columns with the forgery of Ware—or, rather, with an 'improved' and more gory and thunderous version 'made in Germany' upon Ware's original. Father John Gerard, S.J., wrote denying the alleged 'Oath.' Whereupon the genial editor inserted a statement charging Father Gerard with mendacity. The learned Jesuit then put the matter into the hands of a lawyer, and the *Tablet* announces that 'the *Methodist Weekly* is going to fight. We are glad to hear it,' says our London contemporary, 'and so, we are sure, must be Father John Gerard himself, who will at last have the opportunity of repudiating this odious calumny against himself and his religious brethren in the witness-box.'

A Genuine Oath.

The forger Ware and his German copyists all seem to have shared alike the principle of ethics laid down in L'Estrange's fable of the Gentleman and his Lawyer. The fable runs as follows: 'A gentleman that had a suit in Chancery was called upon by his counsel to put in an answer, for fear of incurring a contempt. "Well," says the Cavalier, "and why is not my answer put in, then?" "How could I draw your answer," said the lawyer, "without knowing what you can swear?" "Pox on your scruples" said the client again, "pray, do you the part of a lawyer, and draw me a sufficient answer; and let me alone to do the part of a gentleman and swear it.'" Robert Ware—who is notorious for his forgeries—concocted what he considered 'a sufficient answer' to the Jesuits. His German clients not alone swore it 'like gentlemen,' but 'improved' upon it in details here and there. And all were tarred with the same old brush of the father of lies.

*

Even during the frenzy of the 'Popish Plot,' there was found a colleague of the infamous Titus Oats who was honest enough to give what Father Gerard terms a perfectly fair, though 'somewhat awkward, and not always grammatical,' translation of the oath taken by the professed Jesuits. It runs as follows: 'I, N., make my profession, and promise to the Omnipotent God, before His Virgin Mother and all the whole Court of Heaven, and all that here stand by, and to you our reverend Father General of the Society of Jesus, God's lieutenant, and to your successors (or: to you Rev. Fr.—, in place of the General of the Society, God's lieutenant, and to his successors), perpetual poverty, chastity and obedience, and, accordingly, peculiar care in the education of youth, consentaneous to the form of living contained in the Apostolic letters of the Society of Jesus and in the Constitutions thereof. Moreover, I promise special obedience to the Pope concerning missions, as contained in the same Apostolic letters and Constitutions.'

Our Sectarian 'System.'

Some time ago we ruffled the feathers of one of our leading New Zealand dailies by pointing out—and proving, too—that 'our great National System,' so far from being undenominational, is strictly sectarian, and that, instead of being secular, it is rankly Secularist. Our contemporary has had abundant time to get unruffled and can probably stand another dose of the same prescription that raised its top-knot then. From our