

ous Monsieur. Both I thought were in the extreme; the one appeared to me not sufficiently communicative, and the other was the disagreeable vehicle of an all-engrossing volubility. I fairly wished that I could compound the matter between them, or that they would make a mutual exchange of a certain portion of each other's convivial qualities. The amalgamation, it appeared to me, would have a very happy effect.

In mixed companies I had an opportunity of hearing the opinions of residents of Paris and of those in the provinces, on several subjects. In England we frequently hear of the veneration with which Frenchmen recall the memory of Napoleon, and of the enthusiasm with which they expatiate on the happiness they enjoyed under his rule. I, however, cannot confirm such reports from experience; I have heard nothing from the mouths of Frenchmen bordering on extatic admiration of that *great man*, nor expressive of censure of the present king and government; under whose dominion, if they do not possess every happiness, they, at least, seem to think they are improving, and will ultimately enjoy the fruits of a just and peaceful reign. All, it is true, are not equally contented, because, wherever there are poverty and vice, men will, whatever statesmen may say, acquire the habit of complaining.

The topic, the discussion of which excited my attention most strongly, was, the restoration of religion: some warmly maintained that the Revolution was productive of much benefit to religion; that there were apparent causes for such a revulsion of national feeling; that the clergy did not, for various reasons, possess the confidence of the people; that when they ceased to be objects of

esteem, they were numbered with the enemies of the nation, and were, therefore, more recklessly and deservedly persecuted. Others denied, with more powerful and convincing argument; that the Revolution was productive of the alleged benefits; they maintained that the existence of abuses, however enormous, could not sanction the indiscriminate slaughter of the innocent and the guilty; that, however individuals may have degraded their high office, by becoming tools to carry into operation the mischievous measures of the court, instead of proclaiming the precepts of the Gospel, the many, who censured their conduct by precept and example, should not have been doomed to the fate of traitors: They did not mean to deny that many grievous abuses existed anterior to that direful event, and that it may have been their inevitable result; but witnessing the demoralising effects of the extensive catastrophe, the infidelity it engendered, and the total subversion of all lawful subordination, it was impossible to maintain that the evil it produced, did not, beyond comparison, outweigh the good.

In the same spirit of censure and praise were canvassed the merits of the religious orders. One party maintained that their multiplication was useless, and that monasteries served as refuge for their idle and ambitious; and that it was much more conducive to the public good to have the conduct of every man cognizable by the tribunal of public opinions. The other party, which I considered my own, proved their opinions more sound by analyzing those of their antagonists, and asserted that the order of Latrappe alone was a host in favour of such institutions. Having often heard of this order before, I was anxious to learn what I could concern-