



REV. PERE LACOMBE.

CASTIGATES THE HERALD FOR ITS INSULTS TO THE HALFBREDS.

The Herald's Article "A Venemous Attack," inspired by an "Ignorant Bigot"—Its "Snake" Story a "Malignant Invention"—The Halfbreeds Vindicated—The Tribune's Statements Entirely Corroborated—Father Lacombe's Scheme Grossly Misrepresented by the Herald.

To the Editor of the Alberta Tribune.

MY DEAR SIR,—The other day, passing through Calgary, I came across a very strange editorial in your contemporary, the Herald, of the 17th last. When I saw the heading, "Fisheries of Alberta," I was far from expecting to find so absurd and so false an accusation, against the Halfbreeds of Lac la Biche. Though I am not in the habit of writing to the newspapers and do not like to do so, still, as an old friend and missionary of the Half breeds, I cannot on this occasion remain silent; and I come forward to defend that people, for they are numerous enough to constitute a nation, against the absurd calumnies, to which the editor of the Herald, inspired no doubt by some ignorant bigot, gives publicity.

Speaking of the Half breeds of Lac la Biche, the said editor, whose past record hardly prepared me for such a venomous attack, says:—

"A more poverty-stricken, ignorant, shiftless, superstitious and cheerfully immoral community it would be difficult to imagine. In spite of the fact that they are dependent on the lakes for a living, they are neither good boatmen nor good fishers. The smallest approach to rough weather will keep them hungry and starving at home, and they neither have the craft or the nets requisite to pursue the fish into deep waters even if their superstitious dread of a vast water snake, which they assert lives in the middle of the lake, did not deter them from venturing out there."

Let me take this last accusation first; its absurdity, once proved, will sample for the truth of the other charges. Surely if anybody ought to be acquainted with the legends and fairy tales of the Halfbreeds, I am one; I have been long enough with them to know that the great water snake of the Herald has no relation at Lac la Biche. We never heard about him. Evidently, then, this is either a malicious invention on the part of the editor's informant, or a joke palmed off on some credulous traveller.

The charge that they are neither boatmen nor good fishers is equally ridiculous to any one who has lived with them. No one, I think, will question their old time skill in all that pertains to the chase or to fishing. How then could they have lost their proficiency in aquatic occupations all at once?

As to their poverty, it is precisely to remedy in which a great many suffer, that I am working now a plan or scheme of redemption. When away from the contact of the whites, they might again find their way to live happy and contented.

As for their shiftlessness, well a good deal could be said that would not be pleasant to many thrifty settlers about the unscrupulous frauds practiced upon unsuspecting Half breeds. When honest men have been repeatedly cheated by noisy hypocrites, they naturally get discouraged and prefer peace with poverty to the struggle for existence among people who despise them.

Our half breeds are ignorant, no doubt, about sciences arts, and many other things of civilization, but they know a great deal more about Nature and its varying moods, and the Supreme Being, than many of those who despise them. The Half breed by nature is good, kind, hospitable and obliging, and religious. That's probably the reason they are called superstitious. When I'll come back, I propose to give a few lessons to the simple informant of the Herald, to make him remember that calling names does not alter the truth.

But they are "cheerfully immoral." I pretend and I declare that it is a falsehood. Generally speaking, they are not more immoral than the majority of the new comers in the country. If the charge implies that they are more immoral than the rest of the other people, I emphatically deny it. I have spent

whole seasons with large caravans of buffalo hunters, sometimes many hundreds of families, with the excitement of the wonderful sports, when these brave children of the plains were left to themselves; nevertheless, the crimes, particularly immorality, were very few. If they are less moral to-day (I mean some of them), that is due to the bad influence of the whites. If the Herald and his friends want more details in my assertions, I am ready to give him them.

What makes the Herald's savage onslaught all the more unpardonable is that he extends it to most of the Halfbreeds, of the Territories, when he says: "This community is fairly representative of those half breed settlements in Northern Alberta, whose population Father Lacombe is urging the Government to place on reserves and treat in the same way as they do the Indians." Thus he includes in his sweeping condemnation several thousands of Halfbreeds, whose blood easily boils and who are not likely to forget the Herald's amenities. The Half breeds of other parts of the country will resent this gratuitous insult, for they are very clannish; they have warm hearts for their kith and kin. Such an utterance may provoke very painful reprisals. What purpose of charitable correction can bitter invective of this sort serve?

The end of the sentence last quoted contains an error which I beg to rectify. It is not true that I am asking the Government to treat the Half breeds in the same way as it does the Indians. My plan is different, being more liberal. When it will be convenient, the scheme will be published.

Now, my dear sir, forgive me for taking up so much space in your valuable paper. I hope, for the sake of justice and truth, you will pardon the liberty of the old friend of the Halfbreeds, whom I consider I am bound to defend.

Yours very truly,

FATHER A. LACOMBE, O. M. I.

En route for Ottawa, Winnipeg July 21st, 1895.

THE ENGLISH SYSTEM.

From the Nor'-Wester.

Commenting on Mr. Goldwin Smith's advice to Catholics to take their stand on the broad ground of parental duty and right and maintain that it is every man's duty to educate, as well as to feed and clothe, his own children, the Ottawa Free Press says: "This was the principle upon which these matters were conducted, until recently, in England. The result was widespread ignorance." We are afraid there is greater ignorance outside England than in it, and we have a sample of it in the prevalent Canadian belief that as a result of the working of the English school system the people of that country are a very ignorant lot. It is strange how such a belief can be held in face of the well known fact that the system has turned out the best scholars and greatest minds of their day and generation; in face of the fact that in everything pertaining to the progress of mental development England has for centuries led the world. The Ottawa paper in its ignorance merely repeats what it has heard said by some other authority, equally ignorant. The principle of which it speaks has not been abandoned, as it would appear to think; nor if the leader of the House of Commons counts for anything as an influential factor in the determination of these things is it likely it is to be abandoned for some time to come. It will be better to quote Mr. Ballour himself in reply to the suggestion contained in the Ottawa paper's remark. He went fully into the Educational question in England in a speech at Manchester in the early part of the campaign that closed a short time ago. We need not follow him in his discussion of the two systems of voluntary and board schools, in the course of which he points out what he regards as a great injustice to the former from the pecuniary point of view; the following extract will sufficiently explain his position, and perhaps convince our Ottawa contemporary that it has something yet to learn of the situation in that country:

"Do not let it be thought from what I have said that I, individually, am desirous of discussing this question upon the mere grounds of pounds, shillings and pence, and the

amount of rating to be paid, the pecuniary burden thrown upon this and that class. I will not conceal from you that, speaking for myself—and on this aspect of the question I have no right to speak for any other—it does appear to me that the religious aspect of the question is almost more important than the financial question. I make no complaint of those earnest and conscientious non-conformists and others whose ideal of education is apparently to separate the secular entirely from the religious, or to leave the religious education wholly to parents, and in the schools to teach nothing but the beggarly elements of purely secular education. But, though I do not dispute the right to hold such a view of education, I never will admit that it is the highest, and I never will admit that it is not the grossest of injustices to compel parents who take a different view to put their scheme of education into that which happens to harmonize with the secular view which I have just explained to you. I say it is a monstrous thing to compel parents whose children are at school all day long to send them to schools where the religious training and the religious education which they desire to see instilled in their youthful minds, cannot be instilled, cannot be taught. Those who are parents will, I am sure, sympathize with me. Those who take my view of what is due to the rising generation, those who hold, with the strength of conviction which animates me that it is not merely by passing a number of standards or by satisfying a certain number of Government inspectors that you are going to raise up a generation worthy to be the successors of those who have made England what it is—those who hold that conviction will, I am sure, work shoulder to shoulder with those who desire to preserve as an integral, healthy and prosperous part of our educational system, the voluntary schools by which alone, in my opinion, the best ideal of education can be carried out."

PARENTAL RIGHTS.

From the Nor'-Wester.

In a letter to a Toronto journal Mr Goldwin Smith advises Catholics to take the following stand on the broad ground of parental duty and right: "Let them say that it is every man's duty to educate as well as to feed and clothe his own children, and every man's right to have his children brought up in the way which he conscientiously deems best. Let them say that the State has no right to deprive a man of the means whereby to give his children a religious education by forcing him to pay for a system of which he cannot conscientiously avail himself, and to which his convictions are opposed. They will then occupy a position which it will be extremely difficult to assail, and the sympathy of Liberals of the old school who are favorable to individual and family freedom, will incline to their side." There is no visible reason why Mr. Goldwin Smith should not have added that Conservatives of both the old and the new school would just as strongly incline to their side.

Many of us are too apt to lose sight of the right of parents in our enthusiasm for the rights of the State. That is the fault of a too great superficiality, both individual and communal. Let us examine most carefully the propositions laid down by Mr. Goldwin Smith, and endeavor if we can to pick flaws in them. It is every man's duty to educate, as well as to feed and clothe, his children? If it is not, why draw the line at the children's education? Why not leave the feeding and clothing to the State, as well as the other. Can any one say? Is it every man's right to have his children brought up in the way which he conscientiously deems best? Has the State a superior right to the control of his children. Has it a right to set up a standard of mental and moral training and say that they shall be compelled to have their children conform to it? Has the parent no right in his child, but only the duty of drudging for its food and clothing, the rest being left to the State? Will any one say that? Has the State a right to deprive a man of the means whereby to give his children a religious education,

by forcing him to pay for a system of which he cannot conscientiously avail himself? In other words, has the State a right to put a constraint upon the conscience of its citizens? Has it the right to demand of parents that they shall compel their children to partake of such religious education as it may prescribe, and no other? Any of us who can rise above the superficiality that has made a fetish of State's right will see that to thus supercede the parent and reduce him to the position of absolute irresponsibility is to sap the very foundation on which the true glory of the State must rest.

We think it will be extremely difficult indeed to assail the position laid down by Mr. Goldwin Smith. But, if he is correct, it follows that we have been allowing the State to run away with our reason. We have founded a school system on the theory that the State has sole and complete control of the child, to the absolute exclusion of the slightest pretence of parental authority. We have constructed a huge State machine, into which our children are cast without regard to any prejudices or wishes of parents, and out of which they come in the end all marked, like bits of plate at a silversmith's. But why confine the machine to the mental and moral training of the child? Why not extend its operations so as to include the feeding and clothing also, and when released with the stamp of the mill set him up in business and keep watchful guard over him through life; doctor him with State pills in sickness, and when dead put him in a State coffin and bury him in a State grave? Why not regulate every action of our lives by State machinery? If the State can interfere with the most solemn and important responsibility of the parent in respect to his child, there is no limit to its functions; and if interference can be justified in the one case it should be required in all.

The Vice-Regal Party at St. Albert.

From the Edmonton Bulletin.

St. Albert, basking peacefully beneath the beautiful rays of the setting sun, was awakened to joy and gladness on the evening of the 6th inst., by the announcement of their Excellencies Lord and Lady Aberdeen's arrival. The green, soft carpet of summer sparkled with myriads of flower gems, the birds poured forth their sweetest songs of glee and the perfumed breezes whispered to every ear the glad tidings, the joyous news of the coming of Lord and Lady Aberdeen. Yes, on this memorable evening of the 6th, their Excellencies, escorted by a troop of mounted police, ascended the steep hill that leads to St. Albert palace, the home of the venerable and well beloved Bishop of Alberta. They came not officially, but rather to strengthen the golden chains of friendship that must for ever bind the good together. As their Excellencies approached, the bells of the cathedral chimed their sweetest notes of welcome and the surrounding woods faithfully re-echoed the merry peals. The Vice-Regal party were met at the entrance of the palace grounds, by His Lordship Bishop Grandin, Very Rev. Father Leduc, V. G., Rev. Fathers Remas, Vegreville, Dauphin, Le Marchand, O. M. I., and ushered to the Bishop's drawing room, where a number of invited guests awaited their coming; among whom were noticed D. Maloney, M. L. A., W. H. McKenny, &c., and other principal citizens of St. Albert. After enjoying their visit there, His Lordship, the clergy and guests accompanied by their Excellencies repaired to the convent where the good Grey Nuns and their charming children awaited them. The reception took place in the industrial school departments. A song of welcome was creditably rendered by the children. An address was read by a little Indian girl and very complimentary verses, in honor of the illustrious visitors, were recited by Miss Maggie O'Neil while she presided over a group of little ones who most gracefully presented an offering of flowers. His Excellency made a most flattering reply, congratulating His Lordship, Bishop Grandin, and the good Sisters for the great success obtained in the training and education of Indian children. A pleasing feature of the reception and

one that visibly touched Lord and Lady Aberdeen, was when the little Indian girl who read the address made a mistake and said Lady Mar—when she should have read Lady Aberdeen. His Excellency asked the children: "What do you think the little girl was going to say?" They all answered "Lady Marjorie." This spontaneous response elicited loud applause from the audience and proved that Lady Marjorie, the gifted editor of the "Wee Willie Winkie," was no stranger to the children of St. Albert to whom her charming little journal comes monthly, and like a sunbeam of happiness sheds light and beauty around their home, or as a little St. Albert contributor expresses it in "Wee Willie Winkie":

"Wee Willie Winkie" so pretty and gay,
Came to my house in the Northwest one day,
Dressed in red coat and pictorial vest,
He won my heart and became my guest,
I cherish and keep him with tender care,
My joys and amusements with him I share,
My secrets sweet to him I tell,
For he smiles with joy, and says "they are well."

CHRISTINE CAILLOU.

Lady Aberdeen, with all that noble dignity and kind condescension so characteristic of the truly great, listened and smiled on the happy throng, and while every eye was affectionately directed towards her, she drew from her satchel two handsome prizes, one of which was won by Miss Constance de Cazes for general application and the other by Miss Lillie Monti for general proficiency. The prizes were two brooches; one in gold having the "Irish Village" at the Chicago exhibition engraved on it; the other a shamrock and horseshoe made of Irish conemara marble set in silver. It is needless to say that the nappy recipients were proud of their prizes and that the great honor conferred upon them was duly appreciated. After the singing of "God Save the Queen," the party entered the dining room where a sumptuous luncheon was set. The room was elegantly decorated, pictures of the Aberdeen family were everywhere conspicuous. His Lordship presided at the table and as their Excellencies, Very Rev. Father Leduc and the other guests partook of the repast the greatest gaiety was manifest. Her Excellency was delighted to learn from the Rev. Sister Superior of the convent that the Edmonton hospital in course of construction, was nearly completed. She was also happy to meet the Superior of the new hospital, Rev. Sister Mary Xavier, and promised to recommend this much needed institution to the charitable consideration of the ladies of her association. The parting hour was fast drawing nigh, these delightful moments were about to end, as their Excellencies, accompanied by Bishop Grandin, the clergy and their suites, passed from the convent, bidding adieu to the Lady Superior and the kind Sisters. Their carriage rolled away amid the ringing of bells, the booming of shots and this prayer of the people: Long live our Noble Governor General And his worthy consort, Lady Aberdeen May they in Canada's fair capital For many years represent our Queen.

AN EYE WITNESS.

WONDERFUL MEN.

Look on this:

For the benefit of those who have an idea that nearly all the priests of the Roman Catholic Church are Jesuits, we will state that as a matter of fact there are 357 Fathers and 409 scholars in connection with the Society of Jesus in the United States.—The Independent.

And then on this:

The Jesuits are a secret order. Through the 100,000 confessionals in America they manipulate the voter, the business, the politics of half a million of our citizens. They have their hands upon the secular press and the city governments of this country. They have complete control of the liquor traffic, and that is the greatest factor to-day in our political life. They are the most dangerous enemy in our land.—Rev. J. M. Foster in the Christian Statesman.

The Jesuits are indeed wonderful men, says the Philadelphia Catholic times, but Catholics as we are, we do not share Rev. Foster's belief that they can be in more than one place at one time. Three hundred and fifty-seven Jesuits can fill just 357 confessionals, and they are as ignorant of what transpires in the remaining 99,642 as is Rev. Foster