the awful
in the just
there is evione of that
we raised up
t of destrucountable for
fallen in the
on the scaf-

eeny, Ross, mand, or to

ce.

by Brow n

osed or were y house, viz: lle, Rochon, ed imbruing at not to any s all human ey stand not g of the first. o which we can never be pements, inforgetting his with traitors, ay lead him. the defence. ir witnesses, many of whom are useless, and some, we fear, worse than useless. The testimony as to general character is abundant, and satisfactory. The only individuals who have carried their proof beyond general character to any extent, requiring remark, are Goyette, Rochon, Prieur, and Lanoie. The first of these, Goyette, has endeavoured, we know not for what purpose, to shew that he was at home on certain portions of certain days of the week, during which Beauharnois was in possession of the rebels.

We accordingly learn from Marie Hebert, that she saw him at his house, a mile and a half distant from the village, on the morning of the sixth, for a quarter of an hour, and also on the morning and afternoon of the seventh-two hours in all. This fact, if fact it be, in no degree contradicts or impairs the evidence against the prisoner, and we are at a loss to discover what inference favourable to the prisoner can be drawn from it. The reflection which it appears to us most obviously to suggest, is, that Goyette was on such terms of confidence or authority with the party at Beauharnois, that he was left at full liberty to go and return to and from their position, as might suit his convenience. But the evidence of this woman is weakened by that drawn from another witness on the defence. We are informed by the latter, that Goyette with him, on the morning of the sixth, endeavoured to pass the guard of the rebels stationed at about four acres distant from the village, and was unable to do so, and that their object was to abandon the rebel party. Now if this evidence can be credited, it is favourable, to a certain extent, to the prisoner: but how can it be reconciled with the evidence of Marie Hebert, that he was at home on the morning of the sixth, and the uncontradicted statements of Feeny and Wilson, that he was at the village on the seventh. armed with a sword, and actually engaged. The statements of Hebert neutralize the beneficial tendency of those of Alaire, and connected with the evidence of Feeny and Wilson, as it stands of record, bears an aspect decidedly unfavourable to the prisoner.