

with success. In Toronto their are highly appreciated, and York City their schools stand first rank for efficiency, their having beaten those of the Publics with whom they came into competition, year after year. There is, therefore, that the order of teachers; and Brother Flammery truly that in many countries have gained the highest approval of educators for their success. We admit the difficulty of finding efficient men where the school is conducted in two languages, but for this very reason a better effort should be made to overcome obstacles which lie in the way, supply capable teachers in a language.

It is a difficulty also in dealing with the French population in an English Province, and no doubt part of the present trouble is due to this fact. The Frenchmen are very much attached to their language, and look very much at any one who presumes to speak that language of their should be English. We submit, their consideration that they endeavor to accommodate themselves to the circumstances in which they find themselves placed.

By no means desire that English be forced upon French-Canadians, but the exclusion of French; but, and, especially in Ontario, the far East and West, English is the nature of things must be, the predominant and the language. Our Frenchmen friends should realize this, and should make provision for the proper education of their children in English.

Some before now opposed the views of some Ontario politicians to English upon the French-speaking population, to the exclusion of French.

This course would result in the present rising generation being properly educated at if our French fellow-citizens had here and there through this do not make an effort to have children taught in English, they are behind in the race. It is for their interest and welfare, therefore, urge upon them the necessity of English taught in the French language alone country is a very poor outfit for their own living; and this is especially true of the provinces in which is almost exclusively spoken; to say, in all the provinces of the Union except Quebec.

Whitby, Ont., Sept. 14, 1895
THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London:

Sir—A friend of mine, Mr. Samuel of this town, called my attention to an editorial article in the issue of Sept. 7, wherein you assert that "the Whitty Chronicle is 'one of the best of the kind' in the province." I presume you will be glad to know that I am a religious bigot who holds the conviction that Orangeism is a very poor outfit for their own living; and this is especially true of the provinces in which is almost exclusively spoken; to say, in all the provinces of the Union except Quebec.

I am, yours fraternally,
S. H. GRAHAM, Ed. Chronicle.

An assure our esteemed friend had not the slightest intention of him any injustice in our criticism of the article which appeared in the Whitty Chronicle of July 12. As he has never written any editorial on Orangeism we must not, of hold him responsible for the question, which appears to be written without due consideration of the true nature of Orangeism.

The sentence of the Chronicle reads: "The 12th of July will be celebrated for many a century to the day of the emancipation of our conscience." It was indeed to us to make out how the war performed each year on the July serve in any way to promote and religious liberty; and the becomes all the more difficult of when we remember that these are part in these Calathumpanians are very much less Protestant practice than their Protestant who do not belong to the nation. The whole Orangeism is a paradise for the demagogue who seeks to rise into prominence on the ruins of good-fellowship and citizenship.

THE REV. PRINCIPAL GRANT'S SECOND LETTER.

The Rev. Principal Grant's second letter from Manitoba in reference to the school question of that Province appeared in the *Globe* of Thursday, the 12th inst., and in view of the assertions of Messrs. D'Alton McCarthy and Attorney General Sifton in regard to the Mennonites settled there, it has a special interest, inasmuch as it throws considerable light on the position of the Mennonites in regard to education.

Messrs. McCarthy and Sifton told us that the Mennonites desire Separate schools, and that if Separate schools be allowed the Catholics the Mennonites' demands would have to be acceded to also, and thus the whole school system would be broken up.

The Manitoba Mennonites, as our readers are for the most part aware, are a peculiar Protestant sect coming originally from Germany, but whose members, believing that the performance of military duty is sinful, settled in Russia, to escape their obligations to their own country, the first settlers being granted by the Czar immunity from military service. It was through fear that under the present circumstances of Russia they will be deprived of their privileges that many of them emigrated to Canada and settled in the West.

At the time Messrs. McCarthy and Sifton appealed to the case of the Mennonites as an argument against allowing Separate schools to Catholics we pointed out that the two cases are in no way similar.

These Mennonites are strangers who have come to settle here, and there is good reason why they should accept the institutions of the country as they find them. Principal Grant explains that their reason for desiring schools of their own is that they may perpetuate their peculiar doctrines, but this doctrine to which we have already referred is certainly not a doctrine to which Canada or any other country can give its adhesion; and though we would desire to see all the liberty possible extended to the Mennonites they are looking for too much if they expect the Government to furnish them with the means of propagating a doctrine which would subvert the ability of the State to maintain its own existence. Catholics have no such doctrine as this, and there cannot be any parallel instituted between the two cases.

In addition to this Dr. Grant informs us that the Mennonite belief is that any participation in Government, or any recognition of their obligations to obey the Government, is believed by them to be wrong. It is an insult to the common sense of the community to infer from the case of these curious people, to whom no promises were made by our Government that they should be exempt from all obligations of good citizenship, that the promises which were made to the people of Manitoba when it became part of the Dominion are to be now violated.

The compact by which Separate schools were guaranteed to Manitoba was not made for the benefit of Catholics, as it was not known at the time whether the future minority for the sake of which the guarantees were made would be Catholic or Protestant, and it is no valid reason now to violate that guarantee because it has turned out that it is the Catholics of the Province who are to be protected by it.

But it further appears by Principal Grant's letter that the Manitoba Government is actually now paying illegally a Legislative grant for the support of Mennonite schools, which have no certificated teachers, while it has robbed the Catholic population of their schools, refusing to them at the same time the Legislative aid which is guaranteed to them under the constitution.

The Principal's letter shows in a new light the extent of the tyranny and injustice of which the Greenway Government has been guilty in its treatment of Catholics, and it is a new reason why the Dominion Government and Parliament should pass a satisfactory measure securing that justice which the Legislature of Manitoba so obstinately refuses, unless the semi-rebellious Province retreat from the position it has taken, and to which it apparently still adheres.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

In another column will be found a reply formulated by the Catholic Separate School Board to a statement made by the Rev. Principal Grant in his first letter from Manitoba to the *Globe*. Dr. Grant, though usually fair in his dealings, and disposed to be tolerant, very unnecessarily and wantonly makes an aspersion on the Catholic

clergy generally as if it were their desire to keep the people in ignorance by keeping the schools inefficient. The city of Kingston was referred to as an example of this, Dr. Grant stating that it was through the laity alone that the Catholic schools of Kingston had succeeded so well at the last entrance examinations, that the second, third, and fourth places were taken by Catholic children. The Kingston Separate School Board have resented this aspersion, showing that there was a complete accord between His Grace the Archbishop and the trustees in insisting upon the establishment of a special class of preparation for the Collegiate Institute examinations. The answer of the Board to Dr. Grant explains itself.

Friday, the 20th inst., is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the unjustifiable entry of the Italian troops into Rome, and the taking forcible possession of the Eternal City. This act of spoliation occurred on the 20th of September, 1870. Advantage was taken by King Victor Emmanuel of the fact that the French troops which had been sent by Napoleon III. to guard the possessions of the Pope, had to be withdrawn on account of the war with Germany. As soon as possible after this withdrawal Victor Emmanuel ordered the siege of the city, which lasted but a short time, as Pope Pius IX. was aware that his scanty army could not hold out against the overwhelming invading force, and he gave orders that there should be only a show of resistance as a protest against the usurpation. Notwithstanding the fact that the Italian Government appears to have permanent possession, the question of the restoration of the Pope's independence is still before the world, and there is excellent reason for the belief that it will yet be restored.

An amusing incident of Zola's recent trip to Italy is related by a correspondent, writing to one of the journals from Rome. Zola pretended that he knew by previous study all about the topography of Italy and especially of its great cities, Rome and Venice, and that he could give lessons in that branch to the hackmen. The scholar who acted as his guide in Venice, however, has been talking, and some unpleasant facts have thereby leaked out. He says that after visiting St. Mark's Basilica, and when they were before the palace of the Doge, Zola said:

"This is very fine; it is wonderful, quite wonderful." But something more wonderful followed. "Tell me, sir," he said to the gentleman accompanying him, "who were these Doges? They were the mayors of the city, were they not?"

We have not the least doubt that in his forthcoming romance on Rome, Zola will prove that he has about as much knowledge of the Eternal City as he evidently has concerning Venice. But that matters little to him, as he knows how to invent facts when he cannot discover them otherwise.

The Liberal leaders in England have taken their defeat at the polls with as good a grace as possible, which is the wisest thing they could do. They have not, however, abandoned the principles for which they contended, and even during the debate on the address, Sir William Harcourt in the House of Commons, and Lord Rosebery in the Upper House took occasion to reassert the adherence of the Liberal party to the principle of Home Rule for Ireland. Sir William Harcourt said:

"In Ireland, whatever change there may have been elsewhere, the majority of the electors in favor of Home Rule is not less, but I believe greater than before. The Irish question remains as a question to be settled."

In the House of Lords, the late premier was still more clear on the subject. He said:

"I do not regard this (the general) election as finally settling the attitude of England with regard to self-government for Ireland. . . . The fate of Ireland is largely in her own hands. . . . I take it that we do not and never shall understand the Irish character—that our best hopes for seeing Irish business—definitely Irish business—satisfactorily carried on is by means of the Irish themselves."

We deal in another column with the action of one of the delegates of the Trades and Labor Congress held in London a short time ago, and deem it but right to draw attention to another point in connection with its deliberations. The Trades and Labor Congress is largely composed of a body of intelligent and conscientious men who seek to uplift the toiling masses. In this their work is most commendable. It is a pity, however, that such men as Mr. St. Pierre are given

a representative capacity. It would appear from the action of such men that "self" should be the all-governing principle. We would like to point out one grave inconsistency of which Mr. St. Pierre is guilty. He submitted a resolution the first words of which read: "Inasmuch as the present school system is costly," etc. We all know that school-teachers, as a body, are not sufficiently remunerated for their labors. Mr. St. Pierre is a workman who would like to have a nice fat salary, but in order that his school taxes might be lessened, he would be willing that the salaries of teachers should be very materially lowered. Is not a teacher as much entitled to protection as is Mr. St. Pierre? What great people some of us are! How patriotic and how liberal! But when it comes to a matter of dollars and cents, so far as other people are concerned, how miserably mean we are!

LORD ARCHBISHOP CAMPBELL a few days ago caused great excitement in Glencoe, Scotland, by marching through the glen with a company of Highland pipers, playing a dirge, on the anniversary of the massacre of Glencoe. This massacre was perpetrated by command of King William the Third, and the Campbell clan carried it to completion. It was not Lord Campbell's intention to insult the Macdonalds who are the descendants of the massacred clansmen, but it was announced that the object was to expiate in this way the crime of his ancestors. The Macdonalds, however, did not take the matter in good part, and gave His Lordship notice that if he or any others belonging to the clan who murdered their ancestors should attempt a demonstration in Glencoe, the residents would send round the fiery cross, and would gather to break the heads of the intruding Campbells. It was feared that the demonstration would end in bloodshed, but peaceable counsels prevailed, and the Macdonalds made no hostile demonstration, though they looked on at the march of the Campbells without sign of approval, and with an evident desire to begin a fray to break up the demonstration.

THE CHRISTIAN BROTHERS.

Archbishop and People a Unit in School Matters—Reply to Principal Grant—Recent History of the Kingston Separate Schools—The Improvement in the Teaching Staff—How It was Effected.

Kingston News.

The following official report of some of the proceedings at the Separate School Board meeting on Tuesday evening has been furnished to the *News*, as well as to the *Canadian Freeman*:

At a general meeting of the Board of S. S. Trustees, held in St. Mary's school, Tuesday, the 10th inst., notice was taken of Rev. Principal Grant's ungracious and glaringly unjust imputation upon the Most Rev. Archbishop of Kingston in a letter addressed by him last week to the people of the Dominion through the Toronto *Globe*. It reads as follows:

"What is happening in Ontario and Quebec now shows clearly that when the clergy are opposed to what the people believe to be the interests of their children, the clergy will give way or something will break. Who insisted, two years ago, on getting good teachers into the Separate schools of Kingston but the Roman Catholic laity, with the result that, at this year's entrance examination to the Collegiate Institute, the second, third and fourth places were taken by pupils from those schools?"

Had the rev. principal of Queen's university taken the precaution to inquire of any member of the S. S. Board what part, if any, the Archbishop of Kingston had in the dispute between the trustees and the Christian Brothers, which resulted in the withdrawal of lay teachers in the three senior classes and three Sisters legally qualified for the Province of Ontario in the three junior classes of St. Mary's school, he would, we charitably presume, have abstained from suggesting to the people of Canada that His Grace is, or has at any time been, "opposed to what the people believe to be the interests of their children," and, consequently in direct conflict with the laity and the school trustees elected by them. There is no living man, he lay or clerical, who has more zealously labored and successfully contended for the improvement of the Separate schools and the elevation of their standard of education throughout Eastern Ontario than the learned and illustrious prelate to whose pastoral declaration the Catholics of this diocese have, by God's mercy, been conformed. Nor is there any ruler, ecclesiastical or civil, who has more steadfastly maintained the rights of the laity, whether in urban or rural districts, and insured more perfect harmony of mind with them in all his vast and varied undertakings for the advancement of religion and education. Hence it was unanimously resolved by the Board to publish the following declaration, embodying certain extracts from the minutes of their meetings, wherein the action of our Archbishop, and of the Very Rev. Vicar General Kelly, chairman of a dispute that threatened to become serious, is unable to comprehend the peremptory assertion of the contrary line of action by Bro. Oswald under direction, as he says, of his superiors. May I ask you

The controversy between the S. S. Board and the Christian Brothers had its origin in an effort made more than two years ago by a newly-appointed director of the Brothers in this city to frustrate the expressed desire of the Archbishop, communicated to the trustees some years previously, for the formation of a class to prepare pupils for the entrance examination to the Collegiate Institute. This was the whole cause of the trouble, and is referred to in the following terms in a letter addressed by our secretary, in accordance with our directions, to the Brother Director on the 17th June, 1893:

A few years ago, His Grace, the Archbishop, whose strenuous protection of the rights of the laity throughout this diocese is known to all men, sent a message to the Board through his Secretary, that so long as he has no Catholic High School for the superior education of Catholic boys, he will not object to parents sending their children to the Collegiate Institute, to be prepared for entering upon a professional course or acquiring teachers' certificates, and he expressed a desire to have a special class formed in our schools for this purpose and the best attention given to it. This class had been working well, and the pupils passed the entrance examination very creditably last year. But hardly had you come to Kingston, when you violently, and without reference to the trustees, or, as we understand, to the Archbishop, whose authority should be recognized, at least by you, as paramount in his parochial schools, dissolved this class in violation of the rights of both parents and pupils, and to the grievous detriment of the character of our schools which are thus deprived of the sole test whereby the vulgar character of inferiority of our schools may be refuted, and the public may be enabled to judge of the capability and efficiency of the teachers.

The Board expects your long deferred answer to our question within a week from present date.

I am, dear sir, Yours respectfully,

J. J. BEHAN, Secretary.

Subsequent correspondence only made more manifest the determination of the Brother Director to resist the authority of the Board and render all attempts at conciliation useless. Father Kelly, the Chairman of the Board, in whose wisdom and conciliatory spirit all had perfect confidence, was then in Ireland; and it was resolved to let the question drop until his return, in the hope that he would effect a satisfactory settlement. In this he unhappily failed, and nothing remained for the Board but to take the action shown in the following correspondence:

Kingston, June 25, 1893.

Dear Sir—I am instructed by the R. C. S. S. Board of this city to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of June 24, in which you say the "Brothers will never undertake the task of preparing boys for entrance to the Protestant High school of this city, otherwise known as the Collegiate Institute of Kingston. This decision is final." The Board after carefully considering this important and final declaration of the Brothers, respecting the most prominent of their complaints in your management of their school, having unanimously adopted the following resolution:

I am, dear sir, Yours respectfully,

J. J. BEHAN, Sec. S. S. Board.

Moved by J. J. Behan, seconded by M. Campbell.

That whereas, the Christian Brothers in their last communication of June 24, have finally decided that they will not prepare pupils for the entrance examination to the Collegiate Institute as requested by the Board.

Resolved, that in the interests of the Catholic parents and children of the city the Board discontinue the services of the Christian Brothers as teachers in the schools of this city, and that new teachers be procured to take their places—Carried unanimously.

This final resolution was not, however, communicated to the Christian Brothers forthwith; and our Secretary states the reason in a letter to the Superior General of the Christian Brothers:

"I am instructed to state in reference to that grave matter that this resolution was withheld until His Grace the Archbishop of Kingston was made aware of affairs, in the hope that he, whose authority both parties recognize, might be able to bring about a satisfactory solution of the difficulty."

Accordingly the Most Rev. Archbishop wrote to the Superior-General on 30th June, 1893. His very important letter, registered on the minutes of this S. S. Board, explains in direct and unambiguous language his attitude upon the question at issue, and shows how inflexibly he maintained the rights of the laity in the education of their children and the authority of the trustees as the executive of the school law, whilst he pathetically pleads with the Superior of the Christian Brothers not to push things to the extreme by forcing the S. S. Board to dismiss the Brothers from the schools of Kingston—an alternative which he declares to be the occasion of his "most painful apprehensions."

Kingston, 30th June, 1894.

I returned home last evening, and I proceeded to pastoral visitation of the missions to-morrow, I feel bound to communicate with you at once respecting the disagreement between the Brothers and the Board of S. S. trustees. It is deplorable that things should have come to such a pass as Bro. Oswald's "final" letter to the Board, of the 24th inst., too plainly indicate. Since I received your letter in accordance with instructions from his superiors I find it impossible to comprehend its message. For when you and I exchanged ideas in my private capacity of months ago on the question of the "Entrance" class, or preparation of the pupils for the entrance examination of the Collegiate Institute, I pointed out the several reasons why I regard such a class as very important and in one respect necessary; and in conclusion I signified my unhesitating opinion, which I some years previously announced to the Board of Trustees, that the Catholic parents of Kingston have a right to demand their children's preparation in the S. S. school for entrance into the Collegiate Institute, because we have no Catholic High school in which to give them the more advanced course of instruction that is legitimately theirs, and the motive is ordained to provide. You then agreed with me that "the Brothers should have an entrance class for all children whose parents wished them to be prepared for the Collegiate Institute." Our interview concluded with my emphatic repetition of the foregoing sentence and your renewed declaration of concurrence. In view of this agreement, which I then regarded as the settlement of a dispute that threatened to become serious, I am unable to comprehend the peremptory assertion of the contrary line of action by Bro. Oswald under direction, as he says, of his superiors. May I ask you

to kindly give me some explanation or modification of that letter which may help towards an amicable arrangement of the matter?

Although the correspondence on both sides refers definitely to the entrance class, I cannot bring myself to believe that this covers the whole case between the Brothers and the trustees, or accounts for the warlike and uncompromising attitude of Brother Oswald towards the Board, among whom are some of our most worthy and thoroughly Catholic citizens. Your distinct agreement with me that the Brothers should have an "entrance" class in our Separate school, obviously excludes that question from the category of essentials in your new programme, turning the subject over in my thoughts, and searching below the surface for the real principle at issue, I am forcibly reminded of another and more comprehensive declaration made by you in your interview with me above referred to, viz.: that you will recognize no authority but mine in the schools; and if the trustees seek to exercise control, you will send in the Brothers' resignation. Let me ask you to kindly state whether you adhere to this resolve. It is better we should understand one another on this most critical point. For, if that be your determination, further correspondence is useless. The trustees will not forego their rights, and the end has already come.

On this subject you know my mind. As I told you before, our schools being under the S. S. law of the Province, and the Board of trustees being the executive appointed to give the law effect for the support and management of the schools in accordance with the rules of Catholic discipline prescribed by the bishop and the regulations of the school law prescribed by the civil government, their authority is identified with the very existence of our schools, and cannot be dissolved by any one. I sincerely hope that you will assure me of your determination to respect the indisputable rights of the trustees and so allow my most painful apprehensions to be removed. I understand your former declaration on this point, you will reconsider the subject in all its bearings and leave room for a peaceful solution of the difficulty.

I remain, dear Bro. Tobias, Yours most faithfully,

JAMES VINCENT CLEARY, Archbishop of Kingston.

What precise object Rev. Principal Grant aimed at, or what mysterious spirit moved him to make this wanton attack upon our venerated Archbishop in the hearing of the whole Dominion, exceeds our comprehension. That he should frequently misunderstand the public action of the hierarchy in distant regions and in ages long since past, when engaged in their continuous and wondrously effective policy of organizing society on the basis of Christianity and transforming into cultured gentlemen the northern savages that had settled on the rich plains of Europe and throughout successive centuries had resisted the restraints of law and morals by armed force, is nothing very wonderful. But here the reference is to an event that took place but two years ago in this city of Kingston under the Rev. Principal's own eyes, and no falsification of history has intervened for the deception of his mind on this matter. Why then did he charge His Grace, the Archbishop of Kingston, with systematic depression of education in the Catholic schools and with recklessly "opposing what the people believe to be the interests of their children" until he had to "give way or something would break?"

For our part we conclude by stating that throughout the varying conditions of school work in the past fifteen years there has been no antagonism, no dissension, nor a word of difference between the Archbishop and the S. S. Board. The trustees have ever had fullest confidence in his good-will and prudent judgment. They consulted him in every grave difficulty and received his counsel and encouragement with gratitude. They knew how eager he always has been for the improvement of the children in the schools, and the parents also knew this, although they could not know what efforts he had, from time to time, privately made for the betterment of the system of education. We cannot refrain from adding that, in order to save this Board, as far as he could, from being too much oppressed by debt and the annual obligation of interest, His Grace gave us at one time a donation of \$1,000, and subsequently a donation of \$500, that we might be enabled to increase the remuneration to our teachers and thus insure a more efficient staff. For all this we are thankful, and we pray God to reward him and to spare him to us and his people of Kingston city and diocese for many years to come.

In further evidence of the Archbishop of Kingston's earnest solicitude to enhance the efficiency of the teaching staff in our schools, we take the liberty of mentioning this other fact that a few months before the dispute arose between the Brothers and this Board, the Superior of the Brothers having issued a circular announcing their intention of establishing a training school or Novitiate in Toronto for the preparation of English-speaking subjects in the methods of teaching suitable to the Province of Ontario, His Grace Archbishop Cleary gave them the handsome donation of \$500 towards this laudable project.

By order of the S. S. Board.

J. J. BEHAN, Secretary.

A Bishop to his People.

In a letter addressed to the clergy and the members of his diocese, the Right Rev. Bishop de Guesbriand, of Burlington, Vt., speaks the following true and forcible words to parents:

"No father or mother with the least sense of responsibility would allow a child to associate with criminals. And yet the secular papers, which are accessible to the youngest members of the family, are filled with reports of all sorts of crimes.

"In many cases these reports are so detailed as to corrupt the minds of youthful readers and incite them to acts of immorality. As for books, some of the most popular are, at least, dangerous reading. Parents who desire to have their sons and daughters 'unspotted from the world' rather than followers of its fashions, will banish all such literature from their homes as

they would exclude criminals. If it be dishonorable and demoralizing to associate with dissolute men and women, it is certainly to no one's credit or profit to form their acquaintance in books and newspapers which reveal their corrupt minds and describe their shameful deeds."

ATTACK ON A CATHOLIC MISSION IN CHINA.

At Paris the *Missions Catholiques* published an account of the riots of Soochuan on August 11, by an eye-witness, M. Pontaviane, pro Vicar of Western Szechuan. He wrote from Cheng-tu, under date of June 2, as follows:

The Protestants practicing medicine here have behaved a little incautiously from a Chinese point of view. A Chinese woman died after a surgical operation by one of them. Then the most sinister rumors began to circulate. After several days of rowdiness, quiet seemed to be restored, when on the 5th of the 5th moon—May 28—the crowd being assembled in the East Camp for games and amusements of the Twang-Yang festival, a Protestant somewhat rashly came and looked on. The crowd, on noticing him, began to scowl and throw stones at him. He was, however, able to reach his residence, but the crowd chased him and began to pull down houses, and plunder. Having carried away all that was movable, the rest was burnt. We learned the news, Mgr. Durand and I, at midnight. We were not too much alarmed, because the crowd behaves like this almost every year, and sometimes several times a year. A letter informed us that the mob, exasperated by two shots fired the night before by Protestants, had gone to the other residences, and that the most disquieting reports were circulated in town about Europeans. Then Monsignor wrote to the Praetor—the Chinese governor—to claim his protection, but no reply was vouchsafed. Meanwhile the residences of the Protestants were all ablaze, and the evil gang attacked our orphanage. Monsignor went by chair to the Tartar Marshal to make an effort to save at least the palace. At the Tartar gate he was forbidden to enter and was insulted, threatened and compelled to return. Monsignor found himself in the presence of a swarming mob, his chair was broken, and he was obliged to go on foot. He was hit by several stones. A mandarin was about to knock him on the head with a club, but a passenger stopped his arm. At length the officials of the commissary of police succeeded in bringing the Bishop into a shop, and later to the police office. He was safe, but injured. On reaching the residence, I set to work to remove all the most important papers. I had barely time for this. The bandits were upon us so suddenly that I had to scale the wall and seek refuge in the room of a Pagan family living in a shop belonging to the palace. In the space of an hour and a half the palace was gutted. However, the walls were standing. Three red-buttoned mandarins appeared. The crowd dispersed in an instant, and I took advantage of this minute's respite to visit the palace. Everything was destroyed—furniture, pottery, chairs and beds. I was called away by my servant. I was hardly in the street when the furious mob invaded the house and proceeded to pull it down. The Fu Kwan (?) passing by remarked, "Pull down and carry away all you like, but do not set on fire for fear of burning the neighbors' houses." The box containing the revered remains of our venerable martyr, Monsignor Dufresne, was broken and carried away. The skull and a few bones were found in it. In order to further enrage the populace, this skull was nailed up near the site of what was the episcopal palace, with a note informing the people that we lived on human flesh. The demolishers were at work the whole night and the following day. They razed the walls to the ground, and even turned up the soil in hopes of finding the treasure we were supposed to possess. I had found refuge in a Christian family. There I learned that the Bishop was surrounded by a mob, who cursed him and even cuffed him. I did not know what course to take. After three hours mortal anxiety my theologian came running up breathless and informed me that the Bishop was safe at the commissary's. The latter sent an escort with soldiers to take me at 11 o'clock at night to the Bishop. Meanwhile I learned our misfortunes—the orphanage burned and destroyed with the church and rectory, then the hospital and beggar's work-house. About 3 in the morning we were taken in chairs to the law court, where we found eighteen English or Americans reduced, like ourselves, to the condition of prisoners and paupers. I cannot tell you all that we suffered in that hole. The mandarin was civil enough, but the room filthy. Yesterday morning we were taken in chairs to the law court of the Yamen, where we occupy a little building between the Praetor's house and his deputy's. A military guard is outside. It is from this place that I write you this first letter. We have already sent in our complaints, but the hatred of the Viceroy towards us is so great that we do not hope for much. We are alarmed for the rest of the mission. The most dreadful rumors are about, and we fear the worst for the churches, priests and Christians.

The most perfect friendship between men is that which lasts till death, and for which it is their glory to die. But the Heart of Jesus is our Friend during life, at death, and after death; for He gives eternity to those who love Him.—St. Augustine.