

22 February 1856

Monsieur L'Administrateur:

In my last letter my opinion was that the Bill No. 17 having been rejected and no one was talking about it anymore it was not worth bothering with it. But, as our little Puget Sound Courier found pleasure in refreshing the speech of <sup>Mr.</sup> ~~the~~ Bishop I think that our Catholic Citizens will be able to amuse itself and amuse the public a little in commenting on this speech of ~~the~~ <sup>Mr.</sup> Bishop. If you have not already seen it, see the Puget Sound Courier of Feb. 15 and 22, where the second part of the sermon must be delivered.

Our Catholic Citizen will have no trouble refuting the falseness and absurdities thrown in that speech. Make him observe that unfortunately the old Tiaies is not baptized. As so many other chiefs he prefers women to his salvation. We do not have knowledge that Tiaies came on this side last summer. He might have sent, I don't know whom; and we do not have heard it said that he himself came.

Your all devoted

P. Ricard, petre, O.M.I.

P.S.-The real fact is that in the spring of 1853 Mr. Bolon was not yet agent. Now if there is a mistake in printing the paper Courier has 1853 and that instead of 1853 is about the visit that Mr. Bolon (In the paper it is Dolon) and Mr. Doty made in the spring of 1855; here is how Father Durieu wrote me:

"It was Palm Sunday when were ----- the procession (sic) that Mr. Doty arrived with Mr. Bolon and savages for interpret. Father Pandosy went to receive them and entertain them while I was saying High Mass, after which all our people went to greet the agents. Mr. Doty, who had his camp in the middle of the plain, told us his satisfaction to see our savages better dressed and clean than all the others and particularly more polite and more open(sic) The reunion was made the day after the camp of the agent. We had sent express to fetch S<sub>k</sub>lom, Shawawai and Auowai. Tiaies was at Ahtanum, so was Kamaiacan.

The latter extraordinarily discontented the agent. He surrendered long after the others. He has said openly that he did not want to. Finally he did but ~~destroyed~~ he stayed at more than a mile away from the agent's tent and in spite of being called over and over again he never came. Aowai was not arrived so it was sent to the day after. (Sic) Kamaiacan came with all his men armed with their guns. He came this time in the tent but talked only twice. As for place of reunion he insisted to have it in Walla Walla. The agent was thinking to have it in the plain of Simkoue' (sic) and when the agent offered his present, Kamaiacan said that he did not want any. Shawawai having backed his refusal, the others remained silent and no one accepted the presents; in sort, Mr. Doty closed the deal discontented. Happily enough the Psouanapam (Tiaies people) have repaired their fault, on return to the mission, Father Pandosy told them that they had been well? not to have accepted the presents, as they had agreed to cede their lands.

Upon this observation they went back the day after and brought back the gifts to Tiaes and Aourai."

Here is what wrote me Father Durieu, April 12, 1855. Permit me to add a prophetic line that this poor father wrote without suspecting that the accomplishment would follow so soon. "Poor mission of Ahanem.' Could I actually see you somewhere else? Poor people! Poor missionaries! "

If it is a question of the first visit that Mr. Bolon accompanied by Bradford made in April spring, 1854, here is what says F. d Herbomez who was on the place; Aowhaie was at the---at the (sic) piers Novis Mais (///sic) Tiaes was present at the reunion at the savages place which took place at this time. For when the agent told the savages to make complaints against the priests, Tiaies answered that he liked the priests for ~~had~~ they had not done any reproach to make them, and because the priests had done only good and to him and to all the good savages.

Thus, Tiaies not only has never refused to see Mr. Bolon and the other officers of the government but has always been ~~in~~ the first to see them and treat with them in the most friendly way, as with all the white indistinctly. What says ~~the~~ ~~old~~ ~~man~~ Mr. Bishop is therefore lacking all foundation; and ~~never~~ reveals the plan prepared to chase the priests (fer fas et we fas) The talent and wisdom that the Catholic Citizen has shown in its letters assure us that he will handle the affair with same dexterity. Let us leave the dead in peace. Let us not say anything irritating the spirit of the departed. Let us be content in attacking the individuals and as Mr. Bishop has thought it good to <sup>deliver</sup> ~~make~~ his speech to publicity, may it bring him the trouble it should. If he attacks with speech and calumny may he be thrown down by the simple and pure truth.

P. Ricard, petre O.M.I.

To Very Rev. J.B. Brouillet, grand vicar and B, Columbia City, W.T.

(Additional material referred to in note but not in letters:  
part of Puget Sound Courier of February 15, 1856, printed at Steilacoom W.T. It was N<sup>o</sup>. 32 of the first volume A good deal of news to be found in this copy. The speech of Mr. Bishop in favor of the bill, etc.