

1698. } great alarm or oblige me to alter my plans; on the contrary they will rather induce me to press them more vigorously, untoward as may be the results attending them. For these, sir, you will be responsible to your royal master and to heaven.

“You were misinformed, when you were told that the French and Indians settled among us had committed any outrages on the Iroquois. It is very true that the Ottawas and particularly the Algonquins gained a decisive advantage over the Onondagas, because that nation, as well as the rest, had declared that they would make no peace with them; . . . . still I have reason to think that if the Iroquois have not brought back to me all the prisoners taken from us, it is because you formally opposed it. When they return to their duty and keep their word, I will restore those who are here.

“This does not prevent my thanking you for your kind treatment of the four other Frenchmen whom you sent back. I have been sufficiently explicit in regard to some Acadian Indians, and I have always feared, that if those of their people held prisoners at Boston, in such bad faith, are not at once restored, they will get up some expedition against your colony. Still I regret the inroad, which, as you state they have committed. This obliges me to send them a second order to arrest all acts of hostility; but I beg you to restore them their people, as to whom you give me no answer. You perceive that I speak to you with the same frankness and freedom that you do.”<sup>1</sup>

It is quite surprising that Frontenac made no reply to the passage in Chevalier Bellomont's letter alluding to the missionaries, where nevertheless he had a fine opportunity to convict him of bad faith.<sup>2</sup> For in the first place there

<sup>1</sup> Frontenac to Bellomont, 21st Sept. 1698. N. Y. Col. Doc., iv., p. 420, ix., p. 694. See also *Ib.* p. 682.

<sup>2</sup> After the retirement of the Lambevilles in 1687, (*ante* iii., p. 278.) there had been no missionary in the

cantons except Milet, who was a prisoner at Oneida from 1691 to 1694. Yet Bellomont renews this historical falsehood in the preamble to the N. Y. act of 1700 against Catholic priests.