

YOUNG WOMEN

IN

CONVENTS OR PRIESTS' PRISONS

TO BE PROTECTED BY LAW,

OR THE

PRISONS TO BE BROKEN UP.

A LECTURE

DELIVERED AT THE MARYLAND INSTITUTE,

On Monday Evening, February 25th, 1856.

BY

ANDREW B. CROSS.



BALTIMORE:

PRINTED BY SHERWOOD & CO.

N. W. COR. BALTIMORE AND GAY STREETS.

1856.

NOTICE.

On February 7th, 1856, a memorial was presented to the House of Delegates of Maryland, representing that there are *private prisons* called convents, in this State, where young women are imprisoned, not for crime, not under officers of the law, but by agents of the Pope of Rome. That when enticed into them and completely under their control, with their property secured to the convent, they have been treated with severity, compelled to labor as slaves, shut up in prison and otherwise punished if they manifest a desire to escape.

The case of *Olevia Neal*, who in 1839 escaped for the second time, having been forced back by Priest Gildea and punished, for her first escape; his second attempt to force her back, and her rescue by the people, who were so excited that they had well nigh torn down the building: The scream for help in the same convent in 1835:

The fact that these prisons are engines of Popish despotism and cruelty, opposed to every principle of liberty and human rights, inquisitions in embryo, in which by stealth they accomplish the purpose of seizing upon the person and estate of their victims, and practicing the oppression and crime which has made them a curse on the earth: Cutting her off from all intercourse with society and hiding her in a dungeon, making it impossible to avail herself of the writ of Habeas Corpus:

These with other reasons were presented, showing the propriety of passing a law which should protect those in these prisons, or one which should utterly suppress them.

The Hon. Mr. Merrick, of Charles county, ex-Senator of the United States, and Mr. B. G. Harris, a lawyer of St. Mary's county, denounced the author as infamous and the memorial as false. Both opposed its reception. Mr. M. said "it would be a war to the knife, and from the point to the hilt." *Olevia Neal* he said he knew to be insane. Mr. Harris, after denouncing the author, confirmed Mr. M. about *Olevia Neal*. When he finished his two speeches, he came to the door of the Hall of Delegates and said, "We had him on the cross;" and with an oath added, "*He ought to be crucified.*"

Shall a citizen be assassinated or crucified for asking for the passage of a law which shall protect young women in the convents or prisons of the Priests of Rome? If so, let Rome and her friends hasten to the work, for the voice of the American People is, that these prisons must be brought under the law, and the inmates secured in their personal liberty and civil rights, or the prisons must be broken up.

ANDREW B. CROSS.

BALTIMORE, March 31st, 1856.

A LECTURE.

But this is a people robbed and spoiled; they are all of them snared in holes, and they are hid in prison houses; they are for a prey, and none delivereth, for a spoil and none saith, restore.—*Isa.* 42, 22.

THERE is a great difference between a citizen and a subject. For a citizen to become a subject, is to return from liberty to bondage. No man properly appreciates liberty who would part with it at any price. He does not deserve liberty, who does not desire the same for others.

Citizenship is our birthright. We know no masters but our laws, made by our representatives. We are responsible for their character and execution. To suppose that we would intentionally select men to make laws destructive of the liberties and individual rights of any one of our people, is to suppose that we would enslave ourselves.

We do not expect perfection in our legislators, but we expect integrity and a readiness to do what is right. John Milton said, "*When complaints are freely heard, carefully considered, and speedily reformed, that is the utmost bound of civil liberty yet attained, or for which wise men look.*" Then the right of a single citizen will be sacred, and as promptly considered as that of ten thousand.

With the bill of rights in his hands, we are amazed at any legislator questioning the right of a single citizen to

petition. Prejudice and passion so often fill the minds of men, that if such rights were not guaranteed beyond controversy, it would be impossible for any man to avail himself of them, unless he was with the majority. Every legislature would need to define on what subject they would allow their constituents to petition. In despotic governments those who have an inalienable right to liberty are compelled as *subjects* to obey; yet a condemned criminal may petition.

A petition representing grievances, and asking redress, should be respectful, aiming at the removal of the evil complained of, and in general ought to contain the reasons why it should be received, and the remedy it proposes. Citizens come before their representatives, not their masters, and represent that *there are in this State prisons, under the control of subjects of a foreign Potentate, not regulated by our laws, but by laws which are in violation of the great principles of American liberty*; that these prisons are subversive of freedom, and destructive of the rights of citizens; that they are the same that they have been in those countries where the corruption and crime existing within them required of the people to destroy them.

If in countries where a man cannot exercise the rights of a citizen, but as a subject groaning under the dominion of despotic rulers, such has been their character that the very subjects have risen and destroyed them, it certainly cannot be disrespectful or criminal for a citizen or citizens to petition their own representatives, without even a fact mentioned, but only with the knowledge of their charac-

ter in other countries, to pass a law for the protection of the young women whom they have here inveigled.

We expected Rome to move to her foundations. We looked for a volley of abuse, and calumny and slander. We knew that if she dared, she would make it, in the language of *Hon. Mr. Merrick, of Charles county*, “*a war to the knife, and from the point to the hilt,*” or of *Mr. B. G. Harris, of St. Mary’s*, at the door of the hall of the House of Delegates, when swearing, he said, “*we had him on the cross, * * * * him. He ought to be crucified.*”

When we heard these speeches, we were forcibly reminded of the days when our fathers petitioned for laws to protect them; “when their petitions were slighted, their remonstrances produced violence and insult, their supplication disregarded, and they spurned with contempt from the foot of the throne.” It was then that Patrick Henry said, “If we wish to be free—if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges, if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, we must fight.” If when they were *subjects* of kingly dominion, and aristocratic insolence, they would not yield their rights, is it to be supposed that we *as citizens* will fall down upon our knees, and say to the men whom we have elected to make laws for us, *ye are our lords, rule over us?*

It might be that we had mistaken our rights, that the grievances complained of were imaginary. Shall we be crucified for that? But it may be that they are *real*. If so, are they not worthy of an inquiry? If innocent, would not the keepers, the jailors, be the first to demand the law?

What would be thought of the keeper of a county jail, or of the state's prison, if, when charged through the press, and by complaint before the Legislature of keeping persons in prison who were entitled to their freedom, his friends would make the most furious assaults upon those making the charge? Would that be a sufficient answer? Mr. Merrick or Mr. Harris knows little of American citizens, if they think this will be satisfactory.

A citizen of Queen Anne's county paid 12 dollars for a license, but the court suppressed it because he had kept a disorderly house. He could not use his license, and applied by petition to the Legislature to pay the money back. They received *his* petition, referred *it* to a committee, considered, reconsidered and paid him the same. Citizens petitioned for the protection of birds—no man objected.

But a petition for the protection of young women, who unsuspectingly have been snared and imprisoned by artful fowlers, who first carefully laid and baited the snare, and when they had caught their prey, made her their victim, seizing upon her property, robbing and spoiling her of all that she had, hiding her in their prison houses for a prey until they have reduced her under discipline to such obedience that they can trust her out as a slave, under their absolute mastery, as teacher or nurse, to bring a revenue to her masters, or sending her into the thickest of danger, where yellow fever or cholera rages, without any will of her own, that she may attract attention and make capital for her lordly masters who roll in luxurious excess; or if she be unwilling to enter upon the cruel ser-

vice, to be treated as the deserter from an army, shot down or tortured unto death by her fellow soldiers under the command of men, who are captains in the army of this despotic ruler—men who have been the jailors and inquisitors sent to us from those countries where they have been wont to laugh

“ At all the groans that came
From rack, and scourge and flame,
At infant’s feeble wail and woman’s plaints.”

On such a subject, shall a petition be spurned or carried from the house, as Mr. Harris said, by the hands of the common hangman, and the author crucified? Will the good sense of the citizens of Maryland say it should be laid on the table? *Shall these young women be for a prey, and none deliver? Shall they be for a spoil and none say restore?* Thirteen members of the House were for consideration, some were for prudently waiting until the way was clear, some for not acting at all until they saw how it would affect the Presidential election, and others considered it an infamous, outrageous thing to insinuate that these women needed any protection. We wait the issue.

In October, 1854, Ubaldus Borzinsky, a monk of the order of Brothers of Mercy, addressed to Pope Pius IX, a petition, praying him to redress the horrible abuses and immoralities practiced in the convents of Bohemia. For his petition he was forcibly removed from Prague and imprisoned in the monastery at Gortz, and is still in confinement. His brother turned Lutheran, they seized him and immured him in a mad-house at Prague.

Our petition sets forth that they are prisons, under jailors who are not amenable to our laws, but to a foreign Potentate. A prison is a place of confinement and restraint. The woman or man chained to a rock, a tree, the floor, is imprisoned. A house shut up, where persons are compelled to stay, is a prison. Dungeons, cells, chains, iron grates and walls are the accompaniments of prisons. The rules and regulations within these constitute the severity and cruelty of the prison.

I first read extracts from the decrees of the 25th session of the Council of Trent, concerning *Regulars and Nuns*.

“SESS. XXV, CHAP. I.—In order to a perfect profession, obedience, poverty and chastity, with whatever other peculiar vows, rules or precepts may be essential to the order, * * are to be absolutely observed.”

“CHAP. II.—No Nun shall have any goods personal or real of any kind, nor possess or hold them in her own name, or in the name of the convent, but immediately they shall be delivered up to the Superior, and incorporated to the Convent.”

“CHAP. IV.—She shall not go from her Convent, to any other place under pretext of a pious work, without permission from a Superior—nor go from the Convent to her Superiors, unless called by them, and if so found, without a written permission, let her be punished as a deserter from the institution.”

This word *deserter* seems to be a favorite with Rome, keeping up the idea of her army and the rigidity of her rules.

“CHAP. V.—The Council commands all Bishops, under pain of divine punishment, and dread of eternal wrath, to take especial care for the cloistering of the nunneries, diligently to restore the disobedient by ecclesiastical censure, and other punishments, invoking the secular power, and declar-

ing that it shall not be lawful for any nun, after profession, to go out for a short time, under any pretext, unless some lawful cause, without a written permission from a Bishop."

In an expository note we read—"It shall not be lawful for the Bishop to give permission to a mother or sister to enter for the purpose of seeing a daughter or sister that is very sick;" and Pius V says, they shall not go out from any other cause unless a fire or leprosy, &c., prevailing in the Convent.

"CHAP. XIV.—Where a nun is guilty of any delinquency out of the Convent, (such, I suppose, as speaking to a father, mother or sister,) let her be (*severe puniatur*) severely punished by the Bishop, and deprived of her office by her Superior."

The note on the words 'severely punished,' is "that no nun shall be cast out of a convent, however incorrigible—but offending, she shall be castigated by the Superiors, with the ignominy of imprisonment, (the dungeon,) and (*acrius*) *more sharply* according to the offence."

"CHAP. XIX.—If a nun says that she took her vow under the influence of *force* or *fear*, or before the age appointed by law, or *any like cause*, she shall not be heard unless within five years of her professing, and then not unless the causes which she pretends induced her, have been brought before the Superior. And *if she laid aside the habit of her own accord, she shall not be permitted to complain, but be compelled to return to the Convent, and punished as an apostate, and deprived of all the privileges of her order.*"

I turn from this infallible Council, to *St. Alphonsus Liguori*, of whose works the sacred congregation at Rome decreed that there was not one word in his entire writings deserving of censure. In his work, "The Nun Sanctified," he says :

“It is true that even in the cloisters (nunneries) there are some * * * who do not live as a religious ought to live. To be a good religious, and to be content are one and the same thing. * * * I have been accustomed to say that a religious in her convent enjoys a foretaste of Paradise, or suffers an anticipation of hell. To endure the pains of hell is to be separated from God; to be *forced* against the inclination of nature to do the will of others; to be distrusted, despised, reproved and *chastised* by those with whom we live; *to be shut up in a place of confinement from which it is impossible to escape*; in a word, *it is to be in continual torture, without a moment's peace.*”

“Now that you have entered a convent, and that *it is impossible for you to escape,*” * * * “you must make a virtue of necessity; and *if the devil has brought you into a nunnery for your destruction,*” &c. “Francis de Sales being asked his opinion concerning *a person who had become a nun against her will,*” said, “It is true that this child, if she had not been compelled by her parents, would not have left the world,” &c., &c.

“Keep away from the *grates,*” says Liguori, “to be wholly *removed from their relatives*”—“to lose their affection for their friends”—“to guard against all affectionate expressions with those that are seculars”—“to be careful not to make known what may tend to the discredit of the Superiors or Sisters.”

“In obeying the direction of Superiors she is more certain of doing the will of God, than if an angel came down from heaven to manifest his will to her.”

“It may be added that there is more certainty of doing the will of God by obedience to Superiors, than by obedience to Jesus Christ, should he appear in person and give his commands. Because, should Jesus Christ appear to a religious, she would not be certain whether it was he that spoke or an evil spirit, who, under the appearance of the Redeemer, wished to deceive her. * * * *In a word, the only way by which a religious can become a saint, and be saved, is to observe her rule; for her there is no other way that leads to salvation.*”

“The fourth and last degree of perfect obedience,” says he, “is to obey with simplicity. * * St. Mary Magdalene de Pazzi says that perfect obedience requires a soul without a will, and a will without an intellect. * * * To regard as good whatever superiors command, is the blind obedience so much praised by the saints, and is the duty of every religious. * * * To try the obedience of their *subjects*, superiors sometimes impose commands that are inexpedient, and even absurd. St. Francis commanded his disciples to plant cabbages with their roots uppermost.”

I have thus laid down from indisputable authority, the rules, requirements, obedience, chastisements, prisons, dungeons, and punishment more sharp and severe, a continual torture without a moment's peace, an anticipation of hell, and without hope of escape.

Prisons and dungeons and more severe punishments are parts of the religion of Rome. Every officer in the Church below a cardinal is subject to be called to Rome at any time and there imprisoned. In 1838, Bishop Reze, of Detroit, was summoned to Rome. In 1839, was imprisoned in a dungeon, in a Convent under ecclesiastical prosecution. The Almanac of 1837, calls the Tribunal at Rome, “the *Sacred Penitentiary!* the officers of which bind themselves by an oath previously to their entrance upon duty, to observe an *inviolable secrecy* in relation to all matters submitted to their inspection,” &c. “The object of this tribunal is in showing mercy, to punish crime,” &c. On page 61, Almanac 1856, Bishop Reze is reported as having retired from office, and so would we if put in a dungeon, however holy!

If Bishop Reze was an American citizen, is not the summoning of him to Rome, putting him in the dungeon

of a Convent or the Inquisition, an act most outrageous and infamous?

Dr. Achilli, who escaped from the Inquisition at Rome, narrates two cases out of the many that were delivered by the Roman Republic, when Pius IX ran away.

“Pius IX fled from Rome in November, 1848. In February, 1849, the Republic was set up. Eight or ten days after, with ten or twelve of my companions, I went to see if the Inquisition had any occupants. We found the commissary general, his two companions, his secretary, chancellors and jailors. I asked one of the jailors if there were any prisoners in the cells.

“According to the laws of the Inquisition he was not at liberty to give an honest answer, but shrugged his shoulders, which meant there were plenty. My companions were for at once examining the cells and dungeons, and were for compelling the jailors to open the gates. I begged them to desist and inform the Government. The Government being informed, sent and examined, found many and liberated them. Among these was *Bishop Cashur, of Cairo*, who had been *twenty-five years* in his dungeon. After being delivered from the prison, he was carried about the streets of Rome in triumph.

“Another, a monk about sixty years of age, was imprisoned in the convent of Franciscans called the convent of Araceoli. For *twelve years* he had been immured in that horrible hole. This man was a native of South America; he somehow succeeded, on hearing that the republic was proclaimed, in getting word to the National Assembly that he was in this prison. A deputation was at once sent to the Superior to know whether it was true. But the Father Abbot strenuously denied it and refused them admittance. They threatened him and compelled him to open the door of his cell. There they found him. He was almost reduced to blindness, was scarcely able to stand, and had to be supported to get along. He was brought before the National Assembly. All Rome knows of it. All were anxious to know for what cause he was there.

“His answer was, ‘*I have not the most remote idea why I was for twelve years kept in that dungeon; and I had always settled in my mind, and was at peace with myself, never having the slightest hope of seeing the daylight again.*’ He turned and thanked them one after another, for it was to them, he said, he owed his life. A collection was made for him, and he was enabled to return to South America, where he now is.

“Since the return of the Pope, the Inquisition has been renewed, with all its political influence.”

In 1809, the troops of Napoleon, under Col. Lemanski, who is now living in this country, and a Lutheran minister, took Madrid and destroyed an Inquisition in the neighborhood. The whole interior of the building was exquisitely finished. The Inquisitors positively denied having places of punishment, said they were belied. Col. L. was ready to believe them, but Col. DeLile did not. He called for water which he poured on the floor. In one spot it was seen to bubble, a soldier struck the butt of his musket upon the marble slab, and then opened a huge door upon a spring. Here was a stairway down into the regions of cruelty. These holy fathers that had so stoutly denied, grew pale and trembled in every limb. Col. L. took a holy candle and descended with his men. There were instruments of torture, men and women, young and old, perfectly naked, chained to blocks, some mouldering, some dying a lingering, horrible death; some dead, with the chains around the bones, and in all different stages. The instruments of torture were brought out and the soldiers in their fury ceased not until they had put every Inquisitor to death with his own instruments of torture. The news being spread, the people from all the country around came together to find fathers and mothers

and children. The joy and the sorrow of the occasion was beyond description. About one hundred buried for years were brought out. Those who desire to read the account, can find it in Tract No. 460, of the American Tract Society.

St. Liguori might well say, to those unwilling to stay, “*it was an anticipation of hell.*” At the time of the revolution in Italy in 1848, prisons and dungeons were opened in Rome of the same character. See pages 39 and 40 of my letters to T. P. Scott on priests’ prisons for women.

Since 1848, the prisons of Rome have been filled up and running over with the political prisoners proscribed by the Pope. How would it do for all the people of this country who will not vote with and for the Pope’s party, to be put in dungeons? It is one way to get rid of your opponents. This is the way which Rome would prefer. The list of Bishops and Priests in Lucas’ Almanac of 1856 will permit you to infer that they are the same class of men.

In 1836, the book of *Maria Monk* was first published. It has been reprinted, with an elaborate review and appendix. I call attention to it, to illustrate the prisons, the dungeons, and to show the kinds of punishment which are (*acrius*) more sharply. It is one of the most remarkable and powerful exhibitions of the convent system which have been published in the United States. The more carefully and thoroughly the system is examined, the more fully does it confirm the exposition which she has made.

The memoir of Scipio de Ricci, a Catholic Bishop in Tuscany, and the petition of Borzinsky to Pope Pius IX, on the immorality of the convents in Tuscany and Bohemia, throw her book into the shade. No one pretends to question their truth. Her minute statements; the description of persons, places, circumstances; the simple, frank, candid offer to go with any responsible man whom the church would bring out, compare every incident, be convicted as an impostor if they did not prove true; the fact that the bishops, priests and superiors would not consent to it until after they had been six months at work with many hands in tearing down, filling up, and rebuilding; the fact that responsible Protestants of New York city who had examined the case, challenged any three respectable Romanists through the papers for months, without an acceptance on their part; and further, the abundant certificates of citizens of Montreal and vicinity, give a character for truth to the book which cannot be impeached.

Chap. XI contains the horrible murder of a young nun who wanted to escape, by putting her between two feather beds, a *gag* in her mouth, and making the other nuns trample her to death.

Chap. XV of two nuns who had been imprisoned in the dungeons from two to three years, under supposition of unwillingness to comply with the rules, or because they were heiresses to property, which was desired by the convent, the deeds to which they would not consent to sign. The gags used to prevent screaming are described in it.

Miss Reed, in her book, "Six Months in a Convent," says: "The inciting cause which made her to attempt immediate escape, was the overhearing a conversation between the Lady Superior and Bishop, of a plan by which to get her off to Canada. She felt that if she once got into a convent in Canada, *her doom was sealed.*" She tells us that when she first entered, every thing was fair as a gay seducer—but, when the Superior supposed she was in her power, she raged in her authority. Among the penances inflicted, was making the cross on the floor with the tongue, from one side of the room to the other. The mark, at first, was barely perceptible, but, as the blood came from the fretted tongue, the mark became more and more distinct, until the penance ended. For days and weeks it was with the greatest difficulty the nun could eat any food.

Miss Harrison says, "She entered principally under the solicitations of her confessor, who taught her that her eternal salvation depended on her going into a convent."

In Letter V of Rev. Blanco White, he gives a most touching exhibition of the cruel servitude under which his sister was held, at the age of twenty years: leaving an infirm mother, being shut up in prison, and, in two years, coming to an untimely death by consumption. But for the austerity, and slavery, and imprisonment of the convent, she might have lived for years.

Olevia Neal, poor, demented girl, *where is she?* Dr. Stokes, of Mount Hope Asylum, says, she is "hopelessly and irrecoverably insane," and is a patient at Mount Hope.

Mr. Merrick, an ex-United States Senator and member of the House of Delegates, in his virulent speech against my memorial, said, "he knew her from her birth, in her childhood and school-days, and knew that she was deranged. Her family were subject to derangement, and she had this infirmity." Who ever denied this? But of all the places on earth for an individual to be sent, or permitted to go, who was deranged, or subject to derangement, it is a convent, and such a convent as that in Aisquith street, where, according to the Almanac of 1835, "We fast eight months in the year, wear woollen clothing, and sleep on straw beds. Never eat flesh-meat, except in sickness, and when the physician prescribes it." Mr. Merrick read a certificate from Dr. Stewart, that she was insane. Why did he not get Dr. Stewart to say, whether starvation eight months in the year will strengthen a mind in danger of derangement? There would have been some sense in that. Who does not know that weakening the body weakens the mind, that the brain, if weak, needs more careful and proper nourishment than any other part of the human frame? Would Mr. Merrick starve his horse eight months in the year, to make him better fitted for service? Just as well say that a man will be fit to serve his Creator who should starve himself until unfit for any work. The wonder is not that Olevia Neal became insane under her rules, but that all of them do not.

The point before us is, prisons and the punishment of innocent young women. And here I must express my amazement that these friends of Olevia Neal, who knew

her from childhood, should suffer priests to imprison an insane woman, keep her in prison nineteen years, until she had twice escaped, and when the public mind would not suffer her being sent back to the convent, find it expedient to send her to Mount Hope, an hospital under sisters of the church. On the 18th of August, 1839, she escaped from the convent for the second time. When she first escaped, Priest Gildea compelled her to go back, and she was punished according to the rules. She long wanted to escape, but having no friend in whom she could confide, “she sought to throw herself on the public protection.” Her dress was the habit of her order, her arms bare to the elbows, and such evidence of exposure and hardship, that it was thought she was a servant. When Dr. Breckenridge entered the room, and his name was mentioned, extending her arms towards him and repeating his name, almost convulsively, she said, “*I claim your protection!*”

By what authority does the Church of Rome undertake to imprison an American woman in a dungeon in a convent, and say she is of feeble mind? Can you go and arrest one of your neighbors, and put him in prison as a lunatic, and take possession of his property, without a writ *de inquirendo lunatico*? What American citizens cannot do, these foreign priests come and do. What are our laws to them? They trample them under foot in contempt. Seize a young woman, pronounce her insane, drive her into a prison, put her in the cell, or flog her, or punish her (*acrius*) more sharply.

Mr. Merrick says, of his own knowledge, she was

deranged. Now, he makes the convent system most cruel and fiendish. To inflict punishment on a sane person, for attempting to escape, is an outrage upon our laws and the rights of a citizen, but to flog and imprison in a dungeon a *deranged woman*, for her attempt to escape, is an excess of malignity and cruelty.

If there had been no other case than Olevia Neal's, on Mr. Merrick's showing, it is sufficient to require a law to protect them against the discipline of an institution which punishes for any offence, a class of persons whom the law holds unaccountable when they commit murder. If the severity of these rules required the insane to be lashed and imprisoned, on attempting an escape, what mercy can reach those that are sane and attempt an escape? This is more cruel than the bricking up of a young woman alive in the convent at Palermo, or trampling the one to death at Montreal.

Any institution that will enforce such discipline should be brought under the law or destroyed.

If Olevia Neal was insane, what business had she there? If she was not, what right or authority had Priest Gildea, or any priest on earth, to lay his hand upon her to bring her back to prison?

Mr. M., in his zeal against the memorial, assured the House that "this would be a war to the knife, and from the point to the hilt." He was greatly excited, or his memory failed him. Has he forgotten that in France, England and Ireland, it *was* a war to the knife, and that the best blood of these countries was shed by Rome? or does he mean it for the present time? If so, is he pre-

pared to stand to his threat? Will his Church back him in opposing this protection? If he and they are prepared, let him hold up his Papal dagger, that has often drunk the blood of our fathers. *Hold it up!* Its glittering point will reflect an electric shock to the explosion of a magazine of American indignation, that will blow every Convent from its foundation, and like the vision which John saw of Rome in prophecy, they shall fall under the curse of God, like a mighty mill-stone into the sea and be found no more.

I pass other cases and call attention to the testimony of Miss *Bunkley*. Read her book.

It testifies to the deception practiced on scholars and novices before taking the veil. Then the change of treatment, the peremptory demand of absolute obedience, the confinement, exposure, hardships; the casting off of her father, mother, &c.; giving up property, home, country, and in their stead taking the Superiors for mothers, the Priests for fathers and brothers! Then the prisons for homes, the sisters for kindred—a subjection to Superiors in soul and body as the only way of salvation. Slavery for liberty, labor or toil in the most difficult and dangerous places, without any reward.

Consumption, the result of this mode of life, is declared to be “the vocation of nuns.” During ten months of her stay, 14 died of consumption. “*Don’t take a cold, sister,*” said a dying nun to her, “*for it is always fatal here.*”

Such is the extent of insanity, that there is an insane department. What would be thought of a Protestant fe-

male school for any purpose with an insane department? Want of proper nourishment, disappointed expectation, solitary confinement, the drying up of natural affections, rigorous penances, and hopelessness of deliverance from the prison are reasons sufficient to induce madness in the strongest minds.

Her escape—the efforts to bring her back by the Superior under promise to send her to her friends. The letter of priest O'Donnell and the lady Superior, both of whom published statements in violation of the doctrine and practice of the church, as laid down in the council of Trent, which says they must be compelled to return; of Liguori, who says there is no escape.

Dr. De Sanctis, who for many years held prominent offices in and who preached and heard confession in the Convents at Rome for ten years, and was almost daily occupied in them, says in a letter of September 20, 1855, to the editor of Miss Bunkley's Narrative :

“The Convents of Rome may be designated *as prisons—horrible prisons of delusion.*” “A young girl at Rome, who is to any degree interested in religion, if she receives her education at a Convent, must absolutely remain there for ever.” “If not so educated, must necessarily enter a Convent in the end.” The morality and health there is very similar to what we read of among the Convents of this country. One Convent is called “*the buried alive.*” In it in sickness they are prescribed for by the physician of the Convent through an aperture in the wall, &c. “When a near relative of one of their number dies, the Mother Superior mentions that the father or relative of one of them is dead, but no one knows whose father or mother, and each is left to suppose it her own.”

“Imagine what must be an establishment where fifty or sixty women live, as it were, in a prison—women brought together without knowledge of one another, gnawing the

curb of an imprisonment which they affect to make appear voluntary, and which they seek to persuade themselves is such—and you will perceive what must be the nature of their life.” * * * “Suicide by means of the rope or poison is not a very frequent occurrence in nunneries at Rome, *but a species of suicide little known to the world is most frequent there*: I mean that which proceeds from imprudent penances, the injurious repression of innocent affections, the persistent effort to contradict and thwart nature in every possible mode. * * * these and other reasons suffice to account for the fact that *a very considerable portion of Nuns perish in youth, and so many drag through years an existence of continued ailments and infirmities.*”

A majority of the young Nuns in Rome, die deranged before 25 years of age, says Hobart Seymour.

It is said they are more rigid and severe here than in Italy. Mortifications, fastings without meat, enduring exposure, which produces suicide by inches, but in convent life it is called “virtue in heroic degree.”

A Nun or Sister of Charity must give all her property, and bind herself in iron bondage. Early and late she performs the most menial service, unless she or her parents pay a heavy sum to the order. Her food the poorest kind, her clothing coarse, rough; her treatment such as the hardest slaveholder would be unwilling that his slaves should undergo. (We except of course those who are living out as nurses and teachers.) Then, as if determined to cut off all earthly connections—at a moment’s warning a Sister of Charity is sent to any part of the U. States. “Sister,” the lady superior will say, “you are required to go to St. Louis or Iowa, &c., the stage or cars will start at 4 o’clock to-morrow morning.” They have her property. They own her, she must go and

work in the very fire, without complaint. She was a free-born American woman. Her fathers may have shed their blood to give security and protection to her. She is now a slave, and ordered away from the land of her fathers by the authority of a foreign Potentate, without permission to take one glance at her father's house, or speak the word of farewell to the friends of her youth.

Said a gentleman to me a few days since, whose daughter had been inveigled by them, "the infamy of the thing is, that they seem to send them the farthest from the places where their friends live, and at a moment's notice, as if to keep them from having any interest in or hope of seeing their friends. Said the aunt of a little orphan girl that I knew well, after they had gotten her into the sisterhood, they had her teach in Philadelphia, and after a little while I learned they had sent her to Paris.

"I called in the summer of 1852 at the convent of the Sacred Heart, five miles below New York," says the editor of the American Sentinel, "to see my sister-in-law, who was there as a sister. I was treated as Miss Bunkley describes. On our first visit we left sad and disappointed. Several others were made with the same result. She was always accompanied by another. No opportunity was given to say a single word in private, but every thing seemed prepossessing and honorable. On the contrary we do not believe it was so. We concluded this from the parting scene. Breaking through the conventional rules of the institution, the sister ran after us some twenty yards from the house, made a sententious

request, and then returned. The result of this, as we believe, was her removal to Detroit, Michigan, and we have not heard from her for an age. *Where she now is, the Lord only knows. We may never hear of her again.*” Says the same editor, “We heard a Catholic lady of Westminster say she would rather follow her daughter to the grave than see her start to a convent. Commingling, as we have done, with Catholic association, almost the entire female portion express themselves to be averse to the convent system.”

While the *vow of obedience* makes the nuns and sisters *slaves*, the *vow of poverty* makes the convents and the church *rich*. In glancing over the Almanac of 1856, I find in the convents of Maryland and the D. C. 244 professed. On an average each of these will yield on her profession \$1,000—many of them \$10,000 and \$20,000. In Chili the dower is \$2,000. This would give \$244,000 as admission fees of those now living; to which add the dead. These 244 will be worth as servants, nurses and teachers, on an average \$15 per month, or over \$40,000 per annum. This is exclusive of 137 sisters at Emmittsburg, and 500 out as teachers, nurses, &c., that bring in at least \$50,000 more per annum. This is no small capital, and the income is of sufficient value to induce them ^{at} to contend strongly for it. Here we have some idea of the way in which the convents become so immensely rich in papal countries, where every family is urged to make one daughter a nun. It is not to be wondered at that the convents of Sardinia held more than one-half of the real estate of the kingdom exempt from

taxation. Let these immense revenues and donations be accumulating yearly without restriction and taxation, and who can tell the amount of property which Rome will thus hold among us? These vast amounts of property, with the individuals enslaved, is thus used by Rome to accomplish the work of securing more, and the greatest show is made of charity, when it is the purest blind with which to catch those that do not look into it.

They put down the Infirmary and Mount Hope as charitable institutions—see Almanac of 1856. Their price of charity is from \$3 to \$11 per week at the Infirmary, and probably as much or more at Mount Hope. This is *Papal* charity, when you pay them well for any thing they do. The *Protestant* Infirmary provides for one-third of its patients being supported without any cost to themselves, and now fourteen out of twenty are of this class. This is *Protestant* charity.

The poor sisters and nuns know what poverty is by the treatment they receive; while the church and convents know nothing but kidnapping more, receiving dowries, and collecting the wages and earnings of the sisters farmed out.

This very session the Legislature of Maryland refused to let men to whom negro children were bound hire them out. Rome binds to herself, contrary to the spirit of our laws, young American women, and hires them out as nurses and teachers, from Maine to Texas, and the thing is suffered because they call it religion, and you must not interfere with religion.

A kidnapper might arrest fifty or one hundred negroes

in our city, get them into a prison of his own, half starve them, make them go through a discipline which will humble them, and make them afraid to whisper a word against him—then get as many old experienced stool pigeons as will be needed to watch them, and send them out into the community as servants, drawing their wages. To cut them off from any hope of deliverance, by reason of their acquaintances meeting them or hearing of them, let him send them away off, where they will know no one, and there be no danger of detection or escape. This must be done in the name of religion, or the man would get himself into the Penitentiary.

Would such kidnappers part with their prey without a desperate fight? When did power and oppression, and fraud and cruelty ever yield up that from which it was making gain, and living in luxury, without a struggle?

Little did our fathers imagine, having obtained liberty of citizenship for themselves and children, men would ever venture to set up institutions in this land, in the name of religion, to make subjects of their children, rob them of their property and liberty, and use them as their menials, or that they would be permitted to construct prisons in which to entice them, and there shut them up. Little as they ever dreamed of this, we their children have lived to see it. Yes, have lived to see many of their descendants so blinded by the blandishments, and baits and pretensions of those seeking their bondage, that in the name of religion, they approve the deed.

Men have come from Papal countries and erected here

their prisons in the name of convents. Those who have been the jailors there are in charge here. There they professed to be extremely holy. Here the same. They are called Holy Fathers from Italy and Spain, and Portugal, and Germany, and Ireland. Holy in the work of the Holy Inquisition—in the holy service of that Pope who has thousands of his subjects in dungeons and chains because they wish to be free.

During the Protectorship of Oliver Cromwell, Thomas Maynard, English consul at Lisbon, was accused of having said or done something prejudicial to Rome ; he was immediately seized by familiars of the Holy Inquisition. In the name of the Protector the consul's liberation was demanded of the king of Portugal, who replied it was beyond his power to comply with Cromwell's request, that Maynard was in the hands of the Inquisition and that over it the king had no control. A very different opinion from Archbishop Hughes, who said the State, not the Church, was accountable.

Cromwell was not made of the stuff that had first to go and consult all the old political demagogues of the nation, whether it was prudent, but with that honest heart which belongs to our people he spoke out. He instructed Meadows, the representative at the Court of Lisbon, to inform the king "that he must either declare war against the Inquisition, or stand by the results." This message awakened the king and inquisitors. They opened the prison doors to Maynard. Like the Apostle, he would not go forth privately, but demanded a public liberation, which was gladly granted.

The conduct of Cromwell is an exhibition of the American spirit on this convent question. THESE PRISONS MUST BE OPENED, THE YOUNG WOMEN MUST BE FREE, OR THOSE WHO HOLD THEM IN MUST STAND BY THE RESULT. Is there an American that does not say they must be under law, and the law of our State? In vain shall politicians say the consideration of this question is interfering with religion and will not do, because they are afraid of Rome. Before the election they were not afraid. Now they find Rome is so cunning and politic, that they must be cunning and politic, and quietly submit to the priests who rule the prisons.

Legislators, who fear Rome so much that they will not pass a law to protect young women in the prisons of these Priests, will find protectors in the midst of their constituency, who will hold them to the results. [Many voices, *We will protect them.*]

If any man elected by the people of the State of Maryland thinks that a question involving the personal liberty of *one* young woman is a matter of so little importance that it may be put off for two years to inquire how the people will take it, that man is not fit to be intrusted with making laws for freemen; and if, when an appeal is made to him, he will not regard that appeal, *he* must stand by the result.

To vote to receive a petition is nothing. It is a right guaranteed to every citizen by the Constitution. Mr. Harris, who spoke of the right of the Legislature to send a petition from a citizen out of the House, by the hands of the common hangman, should remember that this right

of petition was the second great charter of England's liberties, for violating which Charles the First lost his head and Great Britain these American Protestant Colonies.

The gist of the matter is its consideration. Will you or will you not consider? Will you or will you not pass a law to redress? Some say, no! others, it is doubtful. Some who have secured their offices, say, they will manage to give it the go-by. A member of the House, and political presses who are begging fodder, and corn, and votes from the priests, say, we are mad. The Speaker, after suffering the petitioner to be branded with the most scurrilous epithets without rebuke, declined giving the memorialist the use of the Hall, to defend the memorial because "it was a controversial, sectarian object." Think of that, young women of Maryland! A "controversial, sectarian object," to protect young women in priests' prisons. This is a sectarianism of which I never heard before. But it is a sectarianism that will ere long come to its end.

Perhaps the Speaker came nearer the truth than he thought. God decided long ago that it was not good for man to be alone, and made a helpmate for him. Our Saviour said of a man and his wife, "they twain shall be one flesh." Rome has separated the priests and the nuns into sects, and decided against God.

She says it is better for priests and nuns not to marry. She has made a sect of priests and a sect of nuns. She has shut up the nuns in prison, while the priests are at large. Reverse the order and no harm will be done.

Yet, strange to tell, these priests have such a hankering after nuns and little children that you would think their salvation depended on nuns and orphans. They have such a fondness for the nuns that when they are shut out of the convents, they will climb over the walls and fences to the great discredit of the holy order, as do the priests in the convents of Bohemia. If there had not been one case in this country, the history of convents abroad is sufficiently infamous to have them razed to the foundation. But you have here law of the Church, providing prisons, confiscating the property of nuns, compelling back by force those that might escape, inflicting punishment most severe upon them when brought back; one of the most approved writers, LIGUORI, telling you that “to a nun unwilling to stay, the contempt with which she is treated, and the lashes and other punishments inflicted, must be a *continual torture, an anticipation of hell!*”

In this country those who have escaped cry, “we throw ourselves on the public for protection.” “Will you protect us?” Those within the convent building scream, “Help, help, oh Lord, help.” Will you help?

With such facts before the General Assembly of Maryland, think you it will be sufficient to say that the time has not come, that the Presidential election is coming on, and we must not jeopardize it? And must young American women be kept in prisons, robbed of their property, and tortured to death for the coming two years, because we have to elect a President? I tell you no. If you want to make political capital in doing your duty. Never. Never had you such an opportunity. Pass a good, safe,

judicious, efficient and peremptory law, that will protect young women from the imprisonment, shame, reproach, contempt and torture to which they are exposed, you will have the approbation of the people of Maryland, of the United States, and of the civilized world.

As an American citizen, a Marylander, a Baltimorean, standing within four squares of the house in which I was born, in the midst of my neighbors and friends, with some little knowledge of my own city and State, I think I speak understandingly, when I say, the mind of the great body of the people in this city and State, without respect to party politics or religion, are decidedly in favor of such action as will secure their children from these prisons.

Not only Protestants, whose daughters have been ensnared, and carried away far from them, lest a regard for home and friends might constrain them in an unexpected hour to burst from the cages of their confinement, feel thus. But Roman Catholic fathers and mothers and brothers, feel thus. Two Roman Catholic ladies in this city said to me within the last month, they hoped I would live to see them broken up. If I should not, I leave the work in the hands of a people in the State of Maryland and in the United States, that will burst every prison door and say to the oppressed go free.

The whole scheme of building convents is a great help in the strengthening of the power of Rome. It makes her a moneyed power. She can build school-houses, academies, colleges, and churches. She can control *daily newspapers*, *buy politicians*, influence elections, procure laws, fee lawyers, control trade, so that men in

all these relations dread her. Yet, privately, they will say, every one of these convents ought to be torn to the ground, their foundations razed, and the whole property they have taken from the nuns returned, and the rest confiscated to the State.

These private opinions of the people become the law when brought into the ballot-box. The men whom they elect are expected to attend to their will.

The great impulses that place men in office in this country, are the principles which the people hold.

Those principles are American and Protestant. The cause that has brought them again into action, has been the movements of Rome to set up her standard instead of the American.

Every voice and echo of the American people is, *Not Roman, but American—Not Slaves, but Freemen—Not Papal Institutions, but American.* Not convents, inquisitions, dungeons, racks, and flames—but liberty, safety, protection. Not priestly power and arrogance—but American principle and law. Not Italy, as a late traveler said, “with the Papal navy, consisting of one boat about three times as large as the cabin stove of the steamer Atlantic, filled with custom-house officers, any one of whom he could bribe with two pauls—about twenty cents, with her political prisoners chained together and working for the government, and her fair and beautiful land reduced to such desolation that he would not give \$50 for all that grew between Civita Vecchia and Rome.”

Shall our press be under the muzzle of priests? Lib-

erty of speech at the bidding of an inquisitor, and we carried to the dungeon and the torture for our opinions? Where would we have been this evening if this meeting had been attempted in Rome? The board that rented this hall, the man who speaks to you, and every one of you, would have been arrested, and at this hour have been in the different dungeons of the Pope. Mr. Merrick could there have had the men ready with the knife, who, at the word of the priest, “could have driven it from the point to the hilt.” Mr. Harris could there have found the men who would have brought out your speaker and “*crucified him,*” and no man have dared to repudiate their acts.

But we are in a country where no man dare imprison his fellow man, or drive the knife into his fellow man, without being held accountable for the result; and we mean to hold the priests accountable for the imprisoned women. [Cries, “We will, we will.”]

We are apt to say crime is growing among us, and many a culprit escapes the law; so much so, that one of our citizens remarked the other evening, “that a fellow must try hard now a days for our criminal court to consent to send him to the penitentiary.” But infinitely better that, than to live in a country under a Papal despotism, where a man may have retired from the business of the day to his fireside, and sitting with his family conversing upon the incidents of the day, hears a knock at his door, he rises and opens it, is saluted by one or two gentlemen in long black gowns. “Mr. M. we have called to see if you were in, and to bear to you the com-

pliments of the holy fathers of the inquisition, the respects of his holiness, and to request your company this evening. As it is matter of importance and haste, you will accompany us in the carriage at your door, which we have brought with us." He dare not say farewell to his family; he dare not embrace his wife or children; they dare not show a symptom of grief, or shed a tear; but the wife or child must rise and give the hat or coat, as if glad that he was going; and yet knowing certainly that they will never see him again; probably that night he may be burned to death in the slow fire, or tortured upon the rack, or some other holy implement of these fiends incarnate. Not so bad an institution after all, as Bishop Hughes says.

Never say aught against your country. Remember the old Latin maxim—*mori pro patria est dulce et decorum*—it is sweet and glorious to die for your country. Try and improve it. Stir up the minds of the people. Sow broadcast the seeds of Liberty in every part of your nation. Let every child know what Rome is, and what your fathers have suffered in coming out of the fire.

No man can be sent to our alms house, jail, or penitentiary, without the permit of State or city officers. When there, his interest is taken care of, and examined into every year or every court. They do not confiscate his property. What would be said of the State of Maryland, if when a man was convicted of any small offence, she should confiscate all his property to the State? Would not the people whirl out of office the Legislature that would pass such a law, and require the next one to *dis-*

gorge that property? Suppose a kidnapper should be caught with the man, and his goods, would you say let the man go free, and he may keep the property?

Some say you may pass a law to inspect, but you can go no further. Can't we? Can we not pass a law requiring the return, the disgorging of that which by artifice and fraud has been taken from them? We go for the opening of the prison doors, giving liberty to the captives, and in the language of the prophet, we say, *deliver up the prey—restore the spoil*. Not only protect against betrayers, seducers, and robbers, and oppressors, but compel them to *disgorge* the property of these young women, and give it to those who are living, or where dead, to their lawful heirs. Because of the immense amount that they have swallowed down into their rapacious maws, is that a reason for not requiring it to be disgorged?

You remember that the king of Sardinia was excommunicated by the Pope for breaking up the convents and confiscating their property. Not long since he was invited to Paris by Bonaparte. The Papal Nuncio, Archbishop, &c., could not pay any respect to one under the ban of the Pope. They had all gotten themselves in readiness, with their trunks packed, to leave the kingdom on his entering. Bonaparte put his foot on this. He would hold it a mark of indignity to himself if all the respect becoming was not paid by every one of them. At this the Nuncio telegraphed to Rome, and the Pope sent back word for every one of them to do every thing that Bonaparte required. What an obliging Pope! What

obliging Nuncios and Archbishops! According to accounts they did their best. So that the Pope was really paying his best respects to the man who had broken up the convents and confiscated the property.

American citizens! the day you break them up and confiscate the property, Rome will be on her knees to pay you respect. She is either a lordly, haughty, arrogant tyrant, or a contemptible sycophant on her knees, bespattering with flattery and promises, in hope of laying some plan for a conspiracy by which to secure her lost power.

Shall we be behind Spain and Sardinia—Papal countries under the very nose of the Pope, who have done this to save their nation, families, children, property? If Rome must have her prisons and her dungeons, shall she have our daughters to fill them? And if she has, shall they have no protection there by law?

Be it so that our legislators will not pass a law. That for two years no protection shall be offered, even to quiet the suspicions of many; will that end the matter? Will that silence the cry that comes up into our ears from the cells and dungeons of these prisons? I tell you no. The screams heard in Aisquith street in 1835 have never ceased to be heard, but louder and louder have they sounded, and louder still will they be heard. Ezekiel, when brought to the door of the court, looking in, beheld a hole in the wall, and heard a voice saying, “son of man, *dig now in the wall*; and when I had digged in the wall, behold a door. And he said unto me, go in and behold the wicked abominations they do there.” 8. ch.

7-9. This is the cry of the people. This is the spirit of our institutions. *The people will dig into these prisons.* Think you that another scream shall be heard in that convent for help, and its prison remain closed? I answer for the American spirit in this city. The Pope's navy and priests, and the soldiers that they are trying to drill for his body-guard, will not be able to shut them. If a law is not passed, and an outbreak comes, on their head let the penalty fall who will not say, protect these young women.

Who are opposed to this protection? The priests, the bishops, the officers of the Pope, and that class of editors and politicians who are on their knees, praying to the most holy fathers to help us to *a little fodder, a little corn, and a few more votes.*

The object we aim at is righteous and humane. It is our right to call upon our legislators to pass such laws as will bring them under the control which governs all our institutions. If the priests are not satisfied with that, let them remove to Italy. If they will not remove, and our legislators will not pass a law for the protection of the young women in them, then let us put legislators there that will do it.

There was a heart in Cromwell which I always did admire. The impulses of it moved Great Britain, animated the world, and so terrified the Papacy, that until the present time it makes Popes, bishops and priests *nervous* to hear his name mentioned. When the mournful tidings came to him of Rome's slaughter of the Vaudois, history tells us that "he burst into tears," for though "he

feared not the face of a kingdom, like a child he wept over the down-trodden and oppressed," and said "the sufferings of these poor people lie as near, or rather nearer to my heart, than if it had concerned the nearest relative I had in the world." It was then that, like a lion roused, he let France, and the Duke of Savoy, and the Papal world know that *he* was the *protector of the innocent*. It was then that he dictated to Milton the letter to the Duke of Savoy, expressive of his indignation and determination, if necessary, to enforce it. "A voice which seldom threatened in vain," says Macaulay, "declared that unless favor was shown to these people of God, the English guns would be heard in the dungeon of St. Angelo." A few years since, when an English woman was imprisoned in Tuscany for giving away a copy of God's word to a poor Tuscan, I do not wonder that the English said, O for a Cromwell!

We have a Cromwell—his feeling heart, noble soul, incorruptible principles, resolute purpose, fearless, unflinching courage, and his mighty arm. *That Cromwell is the American people, with American principles.* They stand to-night full grown, and they demand not only protection abroad for their citizens when in Papal countries, what we grant those that come among us, but they demand and will have the young women of our country protected by law, when imprisoned as the *subjects* of that foreign Potentate.

It is the purest child's play for politicians and Papal editors and Popish priests to talk about Americans, who have wives and daughters and family interests, to be do-

ing that which would injure innocent women in convents. The kidnapper running away with his prey has long before this raised the cry against those who were seeking to deliver his victim, but that will not avail him before the law and the people.

The voice of the people is, deliver up the innocent victim. If all is right, come to the law. This is our doctrine ; this is our request of our legislators. Pass a law which shall protect young women in these prisons, or you are preparing a people to lay you on the table and raze to the foundation those prisons.

The great heart of this nation beats for their protection. The politician now, who is not able to distinguish its pulsations, will be permitted to retire from practice. The people want physicians for the healing of civil maladies, who have hearts to feel for their patients and nerve to administer the proper remedy.

Suppose Great Britain had sent over a company of men, with directions to buy up eligible sites in and around all our cities, and on these sites should build from year to year large houses, capable of accommodating hundreds of persons ; around these should build walls ; that these houses should be constructed with cells and dungeons, grates and bars ; that within these buildings she should place trained soldiers in whom she could confide to preserve her secret plans ; furnish funds requisite for the carrying out of her work. Suppose, under seducements held out, she should succeed in persuading American citizens into her buildings, to renounce their citizenship, become subjects of the queen, deed their property to the

prison, bind themselves to serve the queen for life, leave every thing owned or to be inherited to the prison, and through it to the queen. Suppose, further, that on passing by the buildings some of our citizens should hear screams for help; that some should escape; that they should reveal the fact “that as long as they were not entirely bound and their property secured, they were treated with all kindness; that when their property was secured to the prison they were treated as dogs, lashed and put into dungeons for months and years, that at times when they found individuals determined to escape, they put them to death in the most horrid manner.”

Suppose still further, that the rules and regulations of these prisons were discovered, and that they confirmed these statements. Is it necessary to ask what the American people would do? Would to-morrow's sun rise upon such buildings with one brick upon another, or with one captive within those walls? Should they disgorge? Should the property be confiscated?

But, fellow-citizens, here are prisons belonging to the Pope of Rome, of which every particular that I have supposed in regard to England has been demonstrated to be true.

Look at their speculation in whole squares of city property, large quantities of country property with immense buildings, and as they increase in value sold out and others bought—all exempt from taxation and held in trust for the Pope. Men among us who toil and sweat and economize until they have gotten a little house and lot, begin to pay taxes from the day they purchase. They

buy and speculate and amass for Rome, and plead exemption. There is Mount Hope coming in for city lots, and there was St. Mary's College, &c. Look at these things.

But bear in mind that it is not only here. In every city of the United States where they can operate to advantage, they are acting upon the same principle. Look at *Washington city*, where they not only have lots of immense size, nearly whole squares, with churches and asylums and convents—but numerous vacant lots that they have in years past secured, I believe, by donation from the general government, on which they have not built, on which they have not paid tax, and which they now hold at an increase of one, two and perhaps ten-fold their original value, excepting here and there where they may have sold and bought again, still exempt from taxation.

Then *Georgetown*, on the west side of which they hold not by squares, but by acres, probably by hundreds. All these grounds are valuable, and on them they are conducting schools of the most extensive and profitable character, accumulating and amassing money and treasure until they are rivaling the rich estates of the church in Papal countries—all exempt from taxation.

With these treasures they are building and fortifying the prisons and cells for hiding our daughters. They hold the very prisons exempt from taxation.

Compare this with the treatment which Rome measures out to Protestants. It was a great favor at Rome up to the time of the Revolution of 1848, to permit Protestants to assemble for worship in a little mean building outside of the walls of Rome, and when through the agency of our

minister, Mr. Cass, Mr. Hastings was permitted to act as chaplain to the consulate, the Freeman's Journal, Archbishop Hughes's organ, insolently boasted that if he made a single convert, he "*would be kicked out of Rome, though Mr. Cass should bundle up his traps and follow him.*"

When the news came of the chapel being suppressed, the *Catholic Visiter*, published at Pittsburg, in 1848, said :

"For our own part *we take this opportunity of expressing our delight at the suppression of the Protestant chapel at Rome.* This may be thought intolerant, but when, we would ask, did we ever profess to be tolerant of Protestantism, or favor the doctrine that Protestantism ought to be tolerated? On the contrary we hate Protestantism—we detest it with our whole heart and soul, and we pray that our aversion to it may never decrease."

The *Shepherd of the Valley*, November 23, 1851, says :

"*The church is of necessity intolerant.* Heresy she endures when and where she must ; but she hates it, and directs all her energies to its destruction. *If Catholics ever gain an immense numerical majority, religious freedom in this country is at an end.* So our enemies say. *So we believe.*"

We have here the wolf throwing off that sheep's clothing in which it had been appearing among us. It no longer cries persecution, because charged with its bloody spirit. In its raving greed it ventures out before our country and gives us to know that it has only spared the lambs because she durst not seize them. Her course has been secret and silent. By stealth she has seduced and torn away from the fond embrace of parental love the unsuspecting child, and hurried it into her den, there in secret to devour it. When one and another has escaped, she has traduced and slandered them, protesting innocence and perfect harmlessness. But here in these pa-

pers it is the wolf, that same ravening wolf that has wasted and plundered in all Papal countries.

Against this wolf we sound the alarm. We say to every parent, watch your lambs. Beware of the approach of these wolves who come not but for to destroy. Why do they need the dens into which they seek to hide your children, if they are seeking your peace or your child's welfare? No other men build prisons and dens in which to hide the ensnared. It is a work of villainy. The seducer alone seeks their ruin. We go for the destruction of the dens, for the rescuing of the lambs. We protest against any more dens and prisons, and we demand security for those now in their dens and prisons, or their destruction.

We do not ask interference with any interest to which they are entitled as citizens. We maintain that permission to build prisons has not been given them. The least we can ask for is a law clear, decided and efficient, which shall secure the safety of the imprisoned, which shall guard the entrance, that no minors, insane or unwilling, be permitted to enter, that those who are there may be protected, their liberty and property secured to them. If they object against this, then I say *suppress. Amen*, say you. So say I, and I rejoice to hear so many voices say *amen*. Will not all the people say amen and amen?

Our legislators know that we desire no violence. We ask a law to protect young women. Shall we have it? Let them answer the question. The people have answered it. They will have the Pope's prisons in this country, in which young women are imprisoned and

robbed and ruined, brought under the law, or they will put the prisons and jailors where there will be no law needed to interfere.

It is only a political dodge to say that we have the writ of Habeas Corpus. Would the people suffer the burning of widows with the dead bodies of their husbands, because any friend could have that writ applied to take the body from the very fire? There is just as much sense in permitting an institution that buries alive, and tortures to death, with the anguish of hell, because we have a writ of *Habeas Corpus* that would bring out the individuals if found. England could thus have prisons among us in which to hold those that might enlist, or France might establish the Bastille, and all the secret workings of the inquisition, with its hidden tortures, might go on unharmed, until some one would apply for a writ of habeas corpus. Away with such folly. We want protection, or the utter destruction of the system.

PRINCIPLES

Suggested in a Law for the Protection of Young Women in Convents, and to secure them and Sisters of Charity in their Liberty, with proper remuneration for their Services.

1. No young woman shall enter a convent in this State, to become a nun, until she has given notice to the Orphan's Court of the city or county in which she may reside. Nor be received until the Judges, aforesaid, have certified that she is of *sound mind, legal adult age, and enters of her own will*, so expressed in person to said court, which facts shall be recorded with her name, age, place of birth, complexion, and such marks as shall identify her; the names and residence of her parents, or whoever has been her legal guardian, and whether they consent.

2. The court shall then appoint two trustees to take charge of any property which she may have, keep the same for her use if she leave the convent, or for her natural and legal heirs, if she die in the convent. No bequest shall be given by her to any convent, religious or church institution, but shall revert to her heirs as one dying intestate.

3. Every young woman in the convent of said city or county shall appear in the court aforesaid, at least twice in the year, and make known whether it be her desire to remain, or whether she has any cause of complaint. The court shall have power and authority to inspect at any time, and remove any nun, if she intimate her desire, or when they believe that she is not properly cared for.

4. It shall be the duty of the priests, or superiors, or officers of such convents, to furnish to the judges aforesaid, a full and complete list of all the inmates of said convents, names of Superiors, Priests in attendance, and servants, their name, age, and place of birth, the amount of property which the convent may have received from each, and a full inventory of the property, real or personal, held by or belonging to said convents.

5. On receiving said lists, the judges aforesaid shall cite each nun or novice, or any person connected with said institution, to appear in person before said court, and make known whether it be their desire to continue in said convent. If of legal adult age, sound mind, and they desire to continue, the court shall direct a record of the same to be made, and permit said individual to return. They shall appoint Trustees, and all property which she may have had when she entered shall revert to said trustees for her benefit, and if the same has been appropriated by the convent for any purpose, they shall account and pay over to said trustees the amount at which it was valued, to be subject to the conditions of second section.

6. The grand jury where such convents are, shall at each term of the court thoroughly examine said convents; inquiring into the condition of each nun or novice. If any one shall intimate her unwillingness to abide, they shall direct the sheriff to bring said nun or novice before the Orphan's Court, who shall examine into the same, and give her a discharge if she desire.

7. A record shall be kept at the office or reception room of each convent, of the *true* name of each individual in the convent, from the superior and priest or priests in attendance down to the servants of the convent, and opposite each, the name by which known in the convent, which, with a printed copy of this act, shall be placed in a conspicuous place where any visiter on entering may readily observe it; and the Grand Jury when inspecting, and the Orphan's Court when examining the candidates for admission, or the professed, shall see that each candidate or novice is acquainted with its provisions; said room shall be open during the day from 7 A. M. to 6 P. M., during any hour of which, at the request of the nun or her friend, they shall be permitted to converse together without the interference of the superior or a spy.

8. Any nun shall be permitted to leave at her own request, expressed to her superior; and if any superior, or person in charge of said convents, shall refuse her the liberty to go, or attempt by compulsory means to hinder her, said superior, of-

ficer or priest, shall be punished by confinement in the State prison for not less than one nor more than ten years.

9. Each convent shall have some good and respectable physician in regular standing, who shall make annual return to the judges of the Orphan's Court aforesaid, of the various diseases, and the number of cases during the year, and no individual shall be required to perform service when the physician pronounces her an invalid, the death of every inhabitant shall be returned to the clerk of the aforesaid court; the coroner or physician shall report the same with the length of time in the convent, and a notice of which and her disease shall be published in one of the papers of the county or city in which said convent is located.

10. Any priest in attendance upon, or who is accused of crime in any of said convents, or of oppression and cruelty towards any of the inmates, on conviction shall be imprisoned in the State prison, not less than one nor over ten years, except in cases of manslaughter or murder, where they shall be dealt with as other criminals.

11. No nun or sister of charity shall remove from any convent of any other State or any foreign country into any convent of this State, or go from any convent in this State into any other State or foreign country, without the same being brought before the judges aforesaid, and they being fully satisfied that said removal is of her own free will, that she is of sound mind, and of free adult age. A record of which shall be made, the name of the convent from which she came, or the convent or place to which she goes, and the names of the parties coming or going with her, who must also be known to the court, and who shall be required to give satisfactory security to said court, that said removal is not with evil design, and that she shall be forthcoming when required by said court. Her name, age, complexion and marks shall be preserved. A notice of each particular shall be published in at least one of the daily papers of the city of Baltimore, and one of the county papers in which such convent is located.

12. The superiors of the convents shall account with each nun and sister of charity, in regular monthly payments, for

the service rendered to the convent, or as teachers or nurses, rendering them a compensation of at least four dollars per month and their boarding and lodging. When removed from the State, the parties becoming security for the safe return of said sister of charity, shall be held responsible for the full amount of wages, clear of all other expenses from the date of their removal until their return. And in the event of her death they shall account to her heirs.

13. If the superior or principal officer of any convent in this State shall, after sixty days from the passage of an act, neglect or refuse to comply with the requirements thereof, the counties in which convents may be located, shall direct the Orphan's Court of the city of Baltimore or of any of the sheriff of said city or county immediately to cite the Superior or principal officer before said court, to show cause why they have not complied with it, and if they shall still refuse, the judges of the courts aforesaid shall order the sheriff of said city or county to take possession of said convent, suppress the same, and confiscate the property thereof to the State of Maryland, the proceeds of which shall be appropriated to a liquidation of the public debt of the State.