

by passion, should you mislead yourself, and try to mislead others?

In reading the speech which follows that of Mgr. Paquet, I ask myself with sadness, if it is possible that this speech had really been delivered to, and heard by, an audience composed of literary men, gentlemen and ladies? How is it, Professor Wells, in your three pages and a half of invective against the Italian government, you have made use of only thirteen insulting words? Here is your charming vocabulary,—“crafty pretention,”—“sacrilegious hand,”—“parliament composed in the greatest part of sectaries and impious,”—“cursing law,”—“monstrous conduct,”—“iniquitous spoliation,”—“false air of honesty,”—“legal plunder,”—road of iniquity,”—“mean and crawling magistracy,”—hypocrisy badly disguised,”—“deceitful declarations,”—“hateful attempt.”

Thirteen insults in three pages and a half is not bad. I am only astonished that at that meeting there was no one present to protest against your words. But I leave all these epithets to come at facts.

You try to prove that the conversion of the estates exposed the Propaganda to complete ruin. Where are your arguments,—your proofs? You have none. Your only help are the words of the Cardinal Simeoni, expressed in a letter addressed to the bishops of the world. “This sentence,” said he, “strikes at the Propaganda; be it by exposing her to dangers,—to see her fortune in part or totally perish in consequence of events not very impossible,—be it by subordinating the payment of these rents to the arbitrary will of the ruling party,—which is submitting them to the most deplorable uncertainty. It