

Mr. Cameron's Speech.

(Continued from third page.)

Sanderson, called for the Crown. Let us hear what he said about Riel:

"Q. Now, at the time you spoke to him regarding the formation of a Government, did he give you any idea of what kind of a Government he proposed forming?—A. Yes, he was going to divide the country into seven parts, one part was to be for the Canadians, or white settlers, one-seventh, another seventh for the Indians, another seventh for the halfbreeds, and he named over what he was going to do with the rest, I don't recollect the names of the people."

Philip Garnot for the defence said:

"Q. Tell us what he said about that as far as you can remember?—A. He was talking about the country being divided into seven provinces, one for the French, German, Irish, and I don't know what else, there were to be seven different nationalities, and seven different nationalities."

"Q. Did he say he expected any assistance from the people?—A. Yes, he mentioned he expected assistance from them, he mentioned he expected the assistance of an army of several nationalities, and I remember he mentioned the Jews. He expected their assistance and money, he was going to give them a province as a reward for their help. That is what I understood him to say."

"Q. In his conversation with you, or with others in your presence on these subjects, did he at any time give you any intimation that he had any doubt of his success, that any obstacle could prevent him from succeeding?—A. No, he always mentioned that he was going to succeed, that it was a divine mission that he had, and that he was only an instrument in the hands of God."

"Q. When he talked of other matters than religion and the success of his plans, how did he act and talk generally?—A. I never noticed any difference in his talk on other matters, because I never had much intercourse with him only during the time of the trouble, I met him once before that."

"Q. When he spoke of religion and interviews with you, and in the different subjects that he had any idea of thinking of the welfare of anyone?—A. I never saw him with anyone but myself, he was the sole person to be considered?—A. It seemed as if he was working in the interest of the halfbreed population and the settlers generally. He mentioned that."

"Q. Did you communicate to anyone your impression of this man—what you thought of him?—A. I did."

"Q. What did you think of him?—A. I thought the man was crazy, because he acted very foolishly."

Vital Fourmond for the defence said:

"Q. Will you please state upon what facts you based your opinion that the prisoner was not sane on religious or political matters?—A. Permit me to divide the answer into two, the facts before the rebellion, and the facts during the rebellion. Before the rebellion it appeared as if there were two men in the prisoner: in private conversation he was affable, polite, pleasant and a charitable man to me. I noticed that even when he was quietly talking about the affairs of politics and government and he was not contradicted, he was quite rational, but as soon as he was contradicted on these subjects then he became a different man, and he would be carried away with his feelings. He would go so far as to use violent expressions to those who were even his best friends. As soon as the rebellion commenced then he became excited, and he was carried away and he lost all control of himself and of his temper. He went so far, that when a father contradicted him he became quite excited, and he had no respect for him and he often threatened to destroy all the churches. He says: There is danger for you, but thanks for the friendship I have for you, I will protect you from any harm. Once I went to St. Antoine and there I met a number of priests, and Riel says: I have been appointed by the council to be your spiritual adviser. I said our spiritual adviser was the Bishop, and Mr. Riel would not be him. There is only one way you can be our adviser, the only way you can become so is by shooting us, the only way you can direct us is by shooting us, and then you can direct our corpses in any way you like. That was my answer to him."

Such are the opinions of Louis Riel, as disclosed by the evidence at the trial, before and at the time of the rebellion. Let me summarize them: 1. His avowed mission was to redress the wrongs of the halfbreeds. 2. The country was to be divided into seven portions and partitioned among the Bavarians, Poles, Italians, Germans, Irish, Hungarians and Jews. 3. He was to conquer England and Canada; Quebec to be given to the Prussians, Ontario to the Irish, and the Northwest Territory divided among other nationalities. 4. He never appeared to question his success. 5. He was, in his own judgment, the potentate—the sovereign of the land, and could dispose of it at pleasure. It is possible, can it fairly be argued, that a man of education, a man of training, laboring under such delusions, such mental hallucinations, could be held responsible for anything he did to carry out what he believed to be his manifest destiny? But Louis Riel's delusions were not limited to things material. He was, if possible, more irrational on religious questions. He imagined himself inspired. He was to be the head of a new church and the ruler of a new empire. On this subject George Ness, one of the Crown witnesses, says:

"Q. Tell us about their taking you to the church?—A. When we got to the church Mr. Riel commenced saying that he was a prophet, that he could foresee events."

Geo. Ness further says:

"Q. What about the word, Protestant, you used in your examination in chief?—A. He said that on the 17th of March. The difficulty with Father Moulin was in March?—A. Yes, and in February."

"Q. In March he said the priest was a Protestant or something to that effect?—A. Yes."

"Q. Did you consider at that time he acted as he had acted when you first met him in July or August with reference to the priests and religion?—A. No, he acted very much otherwise."

"Q. Now, can your memory enable you to say what he said at that time on the 17th March, in his difficulty with Father Moulin?—A. It was on the 18th March."

"Q. State what took place, the words that were used and how he acted on that occasion?—A. He said the Spirit of God was in him and Father Moulin said he was making a schism against the church, and Riel said Rome had tumbled, Rome at tumbled."

"Q. Proceed if you please, he said the Pope of Rome was not legally Pope?—A. Yes."

"Q. He said the episcopate spiritus had left Rome and come to the Northwest Territories?—A. No, he did not say that."

"Q. Did he say anything of that kind?—A. He said the Spirit of God was in him and that Rome had tumbled, and he could tell future events."

Charles Nolin said:

"The witness is asked if the prisoner ever told him that he considered himself a prophet, and he said yes."

"The witness is asked if after the meal something strange did not happen?—A. There was not a question of the Spirit of God between the witness and the prisoner. The witness says it was not after a commensurate stage or else he was a madman insane on religion and politics, and therefore, one who ought not to be executed. In my judgment he was not a fraud; he was not the most consummate actor that ever trod the political stage. I shall now endeavor to give you a list of specific authorities bearing on this case, and if I can establish that then I think I can satisfactorily establish the proposition that Louis Riel, entertaining those insane delusions on religion and politics, was a responsible being with regard to a crime within the scope of those delusions. Woodman and Tidy in their work of Forensic Medicine at page 867, say:

"One monomaniac will insist that he is possessed by a devil, whilst another believes that he is truly the Trinity. And at page 824 the same authors say: "Religion and politics are entertained by all persons on insanity as a cause of insanity."

Wharton and Stillé at page 122 say: "A common instance is where a man fully believes that the act he is doing is done by the immediate command of God; and he acts under the delusion, and is not held responsible for the act, because he is under the command of a superior power, which supercedes all human laws and the laws of nature."

In such a case the man acting under delusion is not responsible. The same authors say, at page 829: "Remember that mental unsoundness on one point does not always mean unsoundness on other points. In other words, a man may be perfectly capable of managing business; his brain may have all its intellectual vigor, and yet he may be morally unaid, and his moral unsoundness may lead him into crime."

The authorities upon the sane laboring under these limited delusions are quiet and inoffensive except when opposed or excited or when their delusions are touched upon. Upon that subject, the evidence is perfectly clear and explicit upon the questions of religion and politics. He was not insane, he was rational. He contended that he came to the Northwest to fulfil a mission and he was invited to come there. A delegation of the employees of the Government went to Montana and brought him there. He was not a traitor to the Queen, he was a man of high intellect, and he was not a traitor to the Queen. No doubt he was a traitor to this Government. If that constitutes crime, which deserves the punishment of death, then all I can say is, that he sinned with a host of loyal Canadians, to which I have just referred, states further:

"Partial insanity has been much disputed, but in reality is a well marked variety, although often difficult to recognize. In this subject it is of course the same upon all points but one. Religious mania may be considered a monomania. Such patients are seldom violent unless they meet with opposition."

Let me now give you a few instances in the history of medical jurisprudence, taken from the law reports, of men laboring under limited delusions, who have been declared not responsible for the crimes they committed. Woodman and Tidy refer to the case of a scientist who desired, for his own satisfaction to investigate the different forms of insanity, and with that object visited an insane asylum. He knocked at a door, and the door was opened by a gentleman who he supposed was one of the keepers. The visitor went around the institution accompanied by this guide, who referred to one patient after another, described their different delusions, and gave their histories in the clearest and most intelligent manner. At last they arrived at a man who was sitting in a thoughtful and silent mood in a corner, and the stranger said to his guide: "Under what form of madness does that man labor?" "Oh," said the guide, "that man is laboring under many forms of madness. Why that man imagines that he is the Holy Spirit, and would you believe it, I, who am standing before you, am the Holy Spirit in truth and reality." That was the man's sole delusion. Now, let me put this case: Suppose some other man had entertained the same delusion, and had said: "I am the Holy Spirit, and I challenge you to deny it;" and suppose he had killed the other, could it be argued for a single moment that the man who committed that crime would be responsible to the law of the land? I say no, it could not be so argued. Woodman and Tidy refer to another case which occurred in the life of Lord Erskine. While practicing at the English bar, Lord Erskine was retained to defend a man who indicted his brother for false imprisonment in a mad house. Lord Erskine was not informed of the peculiar nature of this man's delusion, and with a view of exposing his hallu-

nation he cross-examined him in the witness box for a whole day. His answers were clear and distinct, and Erskine could not budge him, until, at last, Dr. Sims, the physician of the institution, came into the court room, and said to Lord Erskine: "This man believes in that he is the Lord and Saviour of mankind."

Erskine addressed the witness who was prosecuting his brother, in that character, lamenting the indecency of his ignorant examination. At once the man forgot himself. In the face of the whole court he expressed his forgiveness to Lord Erskine for the mistake he had made, and said: "I, in truth, am the Christ, and this was the man's sole delusion." In everything else he was perfectly sane. Now, I say that Erskine might have been cross-examined by the man for a week or month, and to every answer he would have received a sane and rational reply until he touched the man's peculiar delusion, and the moment he touched that his insanity appeared as clear as the noonday sun. Erskine was tried in the Canadian court for a political crime and been prosecuted by this Government, he would have been convicted, because, under the theory hon. gentlemen opposite are acting upon, if he could distinguish between right and wrong, he would be responsible to the laws of his country which he had violated. Another case of a man who was tried before Lord Mansfield for a very serious crime. In order to test the man's insanity, he was cross-examined for a whole day, and he could not discover in him the slightest trace of insanity; his answers were clear and rational, until the prisoner's physician came into the court, and asked him what he had seen, he answered that he had seen the prisoner in a cherty jail. Instantly, the prisoner forgot himself, and said: "It is true, I was confined in a castle, where, for the want of ink, I wrote letters in cherry juice to the prisoners, and these letters were sent to them in a boat." That was the man's sole delusion, and it settled his case at once. But if he had been tried in Canada under the direction of this Government, he would have been acquitted, because he could distinguish right from wrong. Let me refer to another case. Who, on reading works on medical jurisprudence and the law reports, has not some case of Edward Oxford, who was seen, in 1840, for high treason, in the case of Her Majesty the Queen? Edward Oxford was a man who entertained peculiar dreams, he was a man of bad heart and ill-regulated understanding, so far as one can judge from the evidence. The man was a striking parallel to those of Louis Riel. According to the report of the trial, Oxford was a great man in his own estimation; he was to become a great hero; he was to become famous as a saint and a benefactor of his country. He was a striking parallel to those of Louis Riel. According to the report of the trial, Oxford was a great man in his own estimation; he was to become a great hero; he was to become famous as a saint and a benefactor of his country. He was a striking parallel to those of Louis Riel.

but in obedience to an unseen and irresistible power behind the throne. Now, I shall discuss for a moment or two the evidence of the doctors, because hon. gentlemen opposite say their testimony establishes, beyond doubt, that Riel was not insane. I do not propose to analyze the testimony of Dr. Roy or Dr. Clark, called for the defence, further than to say that both these men are noted experts on insanity, on which subject both have something more than a Canadian reputation. Both had opportunities to examine Riel; one had him under charge for nineteen months as a lunatic, and thus had opportunity to diagnose his case and speak with absolute confidence as to his sanity or insanity. Both were decidedly of opinion that Riel labored under delusions, and was not a responsible agent in matters of religion and politics. The Crown called Dr. Wallace, of Hamilton, to rebut the evidence of the experts I have mentioned. Dr. Wallace declared that he examined Riel for one-half hour, and I recommend the evidence of Dr. Wallace to the attention of those hon. gentlemen who propose to sustain the Government on the motion under discussion. Referring to the evidence called for by the Government themselves, I say of opinion that Riel labored under delusions, and was not a responsible agent in matters of religion and politics. Dr. Wallace on being cross-examined by Mr. Fitzpatrick, gave the following evidence:—

"Cross-examined by Mr. Fitzpatrick. "You have no doubt whatever in your mind from the examination you have made of this man during half an hour, and from the evidence which you heard here, that he is of perfectly sound mind?—A. Well, I should qualify that, in I should qualify my answer to that question. I have had only a limited examination of him, and in any case of obscure mental disease it sometimes takes a very long time before one can make up their mind, but from what I have seen of him I say that I have discovered no symptoms of insanity."

Here is a doctor, called by the Crown to rebut the testimony produced by the prisoner, and he says: "It would be presumption on my part to say that Riel was not insane. I have had men in my asylum for months before I could discover traces of insanity"—and yet this witness is expected to convince an intelligent House of Commons that the evidence which is based on an examination of the prisoner, lasting during the long period of half an hour, of a man he never saw or knew anything of before, is wholly irrefragable."

"Q. Therefore you are obliged to say that all that you have discovered in this case, or all that you are now in a position to say, is that you have not discovered any traces of insanity?—A. That is all I can say, I will allow me to say."

The doctor further says, speaking of megalomania: "It is a condition in which the patient has delusions, grandiose delusions, delusions of greatness."

And again, he says:

"Q. The delusions are that he is rich?—A. Yes."

"Q. And powerful?—A. Yes."

"Q. A great general?—A. Yes."

"Q. A great minister?—A. He may be a great anything and everything."

"Q. A great prophet?—A. Yes."

"Q. Or divinely inspired, or that he is a poet or a musician, in fact, that he is an egotist and selfish man?—A. Yes."

Here is an expert, or a man who professes to be an expert, who tells us what? That he examined the prisoner for half an hour, that his examination was a very limited one, that in obscure cases it takes a very long time to discover insanity, that it would be presumption in him to say that Riel was not insane, that his conscience would not allow him to say that he was sane or not, that in his own experience it takes weeks to discover symptoms of insanity—a thing this doctor undertook to do in half an hour—but that Riel had all the symptoms of the disease known as megalomania. Yet, in the face of the bold and emphatic declaration of the two other medical men, a human life has to be sacrificed. The only other medical man called by the Crown was Dr. Jukes, an employee of the Government, who has had the candor to tell us he knows nothing about insanity, and is therefore not an expert. He is asked the following questions, and gives the following answers:

"Q. Have you devoted your attention to insanity at all specially, or not?—A. Never specially; there are cases of course which occasionally will come under the notice of every general practitioner, but as a special study I have never done so."

"Q. Every medical practitioner, I suppose, has his attention more or less directed to it?—A. Occasionally I have been called upon to certify in cases of insanity."

"Q. And you have never spoken to him on the particular subjects with reference to which he is supposed to have his delusions?—A. I have never spoken to him on either."

"Q. You said, doctor, that you had not made any endeavor to ascertain, during the intercourse which you had with Mr. Riel, whether or not he suffered from any particular mental disease? I did not notice any form of insanity, or any mental disease, unsoundness of mind?—A. I never specially examined him as a lunatic, I never made a special examination of him as a lunatic."

"Q. You never made any special endeavor to discover whether or not he was suffering from any particular form of mental disease?—A. Never, any special endeavor, anything beyond ordinary conversation of the day."

"Q. Is it not a fact there are different forms of insanity which are not discoverable except after considerable endeavor has been made to discover them?—A. Yes; it is so, unquestionably, that you may converse with a man continually and not be aware of his insanity until you touch accidentally, or some other person

(Continued on 6th page.)

Manchester House.

NEW FIRM.

J. A. REID & BRO.

We have pleasure in informing our Customers, and the general public that we have now received a Large and Complete SPRING STOCK of General Dry Goods, Tweeds, &c.

During the Clearing Sale, prior to the dissolution of partnership of the late firm of Reid & Sneyd, the stock was nearly all cleared out; as the result of this, we are enabled to show for the coming Spring An Entirely New Stock.

We have had our Store enlarged, and with increased facilities for the display of Goods, we are showing a LARGER and BETTER ASSORTMENT than usual.

In DRESS GOODS and PRINTS, we show some Special Lines, in the Newest Shades. Our Cottons, Shirtings, Cottonades, Linens, Towels and Towelings are CHEAPER than can be had elsewhere. We are selling a Good Quality Cotton for 3c. per yard, and a Heavy make, Yard Wide, for 5 and 6c. Towelings from 5c. per yard, up.

Special attention will be given to the TAILORING DEPARTMENT. We are now showing the Choicest Stock of Tweeds and Coatings in town. Good All-Wool Tweeds from 35c. per Yard, up. Tweeds bought from us will be cut out Free of Charge. Suits Made to Order in First-Class Style and Workmanship, at Lower Prices than ever before offered.

We have the Latest Novelties in MEN'S FURNISHINGS, Hats, Scarfs, Ties, Collars, &c.

With our experience in buying, and intimate acquaintance with the best markets of Canada, together with ample capital to buy for Cash, we feel justified in saying that we are offering a selection of Goods unsurpassed in value by any other establishment in the County.

We respectfully request an inspection of our Stock, and while thanking those who kindly patronized the late firm, we will endeavor not only to retain, but increase that patronage by selling Goods at the Very Lowest Prices.

Highest Price paid for Butter and Eggs.

JAS. A. REID & BRO.

Goderich, 26th March, 1886.

Our Gr...

Largest, Best...

NEW C...

SOLD C...

SAUN...

VARIETY...

Wall Pap...

Wall Tini...

Carpe...

Hanging...

House P...

The Cheap...

UNDER 7...

West-st., next door...

JOHN McQUARRIE...

Will F...

McQuarrie...

We are now disp...

of Cheap Cash, her...

call. Choicest Teas...

Tobacco,...

Coal Oil,...

Soap, &c.,...

Confectionery,

Remember the Sta...

JOHN McQUARRIE...

Goderich, April 1st.

R. W...

SHEI...

H...

PAINT...

NEW...

Among which will...