

ially, the poisoning of Pope Clement XIV., with all the proofs at his disposal, but says: "But I undertook to prove none of those; let us pass them over," and he blames me for not letting them pass. Was there ever such arrant hypocrisy as this mode of procedure? He gives all the proofs he can possibly rake up to fasten on the Jesuits the crime of having poisoned the Pope, and then coolly tells us he does not undertake to prove anything of the kind, and that I should let it pass. But why does he undertake to prove it? Why does he mention it, and repeat it, if he does not believe it? Why did he assert so audaciously in his former letter all the other charges of assassination of kings against the Jesuits if he did not believe them guilty of such horrible crimes? There is no other solution of the difficulty than the belief that Mr. Austin wanted to fasten all those crimes on the Jesuits, and to leave the impression on his readers that the Fathers were really guilty of every one of them. Mr. Austin calls for honesty and fair play. Where is the honesty or the justice or the Christianity in such wholesale calumny? And in the face of all this hypocrisy he wants me to let it pass. Why should I, the defender of the fair fame of the much-maligned Fathers, allow such a "dark and damning" impression to remain on the minds of the public, when, by a few quotations from history, I can clear them of the infamous imputation? I am accused of quoting manufactured history. When a writer cites day and date and names and facts he does not manufacture history. If I manufactured facts and names, why did not Mr. Austin attempt by a single quotation to disprove my assertions? He could not do it, and I defy him to do it; and, furthermore, I charge him now as being an ignorant historian or a wilful and malicious forger of history. Mr. Austin evidently takes great delight in trotting out once more Pietro Sarpi as a Catholic author, which I deny. His reasons are "that he was the friend of three successive Popes," which he does not attempt to prove. Why does not Mr. Austin tell the whole truth, and say that he was a renegade, that he preached rebellion against Pope Paul V., and was denounced in Rome as a heretic? Martin Luther was a friend of the Pope's before his fall from grace. Henry VIII. was also a friend of the Pope, who conferred on him the title of "defender of the Faith." But all must acknowledge how great a fool a man would make of himself were he to quote Martin Luther and Henry VIII. as Catholic authors, after their prevarications, their crimes and their apostacy. It makes little difference, however, whether Pietro Sarpi was a Roman Catholic or an apostate; his very words, as quoted