of justice. Take
occurred many years
inistration of crimi-
ore humane. The
t that a generation
was tried for the mur-
nd, before the Lord
oner's counsel ap-
e trial on account of
erial witness. And
siding at the court
opposition, without an
g made, but on the
counsel that the trial
d until the next sit-
and an opportunity
er to defend himself,
safully. You will re-
, that in the case of
O'Kon, 1 Blackstone's
the law is very fully
grounds upon which
postpone a trial was
Those grounds have
has day to this, al-
in later times a more
ation of the law has
application was based
that two witnesses,
King of France, were
and the application
should be postponed
d to the country. The
fused, but on the sole
wo witnesses in Ques-
ts of a foreign power,
gn country, and that
bability of their ever
d. The judge in de-
used language which I
think it should go be-
nt of Canada and the
ntry.

ex officio are personal-
mentions. No man is
dered in the light of a
vate prosecutor. No
no proceedings so in-
that upon sufficient
may be put off. Mr.
did not proceed upon
nature of the trial. If
the affidavit is observ-
e special ground of sus-
ses of course."

case the application did
e Court ruled, that this
one week—not ten days
hon. friend from Belle-
week, this man, who
r his life, before a jury
s to him in race and in
o had no sympathy with
of the Northwest
is trial before a court
a jury so chosen,
ttle time to prepare
, and the ruling of the
he trial should peremp-
within one week after the
made. Why was that
ed? Why was not Riel
unity of preparing for his
not give him a month
se, if a month was deem-
himself and his counsel?
him an opportunity to
see papers which he and
ared were necessary for a
estigation of the circum-
rebellion, and an explana-
rtunate position in which
d others had placed them-
sir, that this trial was
ase the word profoundly
the gravity of the occa-
ently hurried on, and he
that opportunity. What
nment afraid of? Were
produce the papers which
t Batoche? Were they
ce the documents which
ling for seven long years
tment of the Interior?
id to produce the letter
etary of State, who posed
friend of the halfbreeds,
renchmen of Fall River,
ag, in substance, that the
no grievences, that they
omplaints, or if they had,
y not sent in petitions.
ernment afraid to present
, signed by laymen, by
y clergymen of both the
nglican churches? Were
t these documents should
o the broad light of the
y afraid to produce those
the Secretary of State
and which the Minister of
ly lately heard of, though
ing in the pigeon holes
partment? In so far as I
with every desire to son-
er dispassionately, I have
conclusion—reluctantly I
he conclusion, that in this
vents fair play and justice
ent to Louis Riel. I am
further; I am prepared
his motion on another
that not only did the Gov-
pperly refuse to postpone
gh their counsel, but that
ion that could be thrown
he defence was thrown in
the defence at the trial
The Government refus-
the papers found at Ba-
refused to produce those
the pigeon holes of the
howing the grievances of
. They refused to produce
hich Riel and his counsel
e absolutely necessary in
might be enabled to for-
defence properly. The
only did that but they
reception of any evidence
show that the halfbreeds
s remaining unredressed
g years. You will find
e of that venerable Mis-
Cross, Father Andre, the

ou yourself communicate
inion Government?—A.
in regard to the rights
the halfbreeds?—A. Yes,
d.
t time? A. I am not sure
In 1882 I did communi-
that have you communi-
t directly.
d you communicate?—A.
ed directly in regard to

tell me in what manner
ated?—A. I communicat-
r, when Riel said he wan-
of the country, because of
that was existing in the

"Q. Did you communicate after that?—A. No; I communicated after the rebellion.

"Q. With whom? A. With the Minister of Public Works.

"Q. Sir Hector Langevin?—A. Yes; asking help for those who were in distress.

"What were the claims of the halfbreeds?—A. Since when? You must distinguish.

"Q. From 1881 to the time of the rebellion?—A. Since the arrival of the prisoner in the country?

"P. Yes—A. It would be difficult to tell that. They changed from time to time since the arrival of the prisoner.

"Q. Finally after these petitions and resolutions had been adopted at the public meetings and sent to the Government, was there a change in the state of things that existed then?—A. The silence of the Government produced great dissatisfaction in the minds of the people.?

"Q. Today are the people in a better position than they were before in regard to the rights they claim?—A. They have not yet received the patents for their lands on the South Saskatchewan."

Then Mr. Osler, counsel for the Crown, instructed by the Government, said:

"I must object to this class of questions being introduced. My learned friends have opened a case of treason justified only by the insanity of the prisoner, and they are now seeking to justify armed rebellion for the redress of their grievances. These two defences are inconsistent, one is no justification at all. We are willing to allow all possible latitude but they have gone as far as I feel they should go. We have allowed them to describe documents which they have not produced, and answers in writing so that they might not be embarrassed and that the outline of the position might be fairly given to the jury, but it is not evidence, and if my learned friend is going into it in detail, I think it is objectionable.

"His Honor Mr. Justice Richardson.—Supposing they are going to produce these writings?

"Mr. Osler.—They could not be evidence, they would not be evidence in justification. That is admitted. It cannot be possible for my learned friend to open the case on one defence and go to the jury indirectly upon another. Of course it is not really any defence in law and should not be gone into with any greater particularity. If this is given in evidence we will have to answer it in many particulars, and then there would be the question of justifying the policy of the Government.

"His Honor Mr. Justice Richardson.—It would be trying the Government.

"Mr. Osler.—It is as it were a counter claim against the Government, and that is not open to any person on a trial for high treason. We have no desire to unduly limit my learned friend, but I cannot consent to try such an issue as that here."

There you see that the very moment the counsel for the prisoner proceeded to examine the witnesses touching the justification, touching these grievances of the halfbreeds, touching the provocation, touching the misconduct and the maladministration of the Government, they are stopped; they can go no further; and for that reason, I say the defence was obstructed. I do not argue—I do not need to argue—that the halfbreeds were justified in the eye of the law, in the strict letter of the law, in resorting to arms. But I do mean to say this, that if the rebellion was provoked by the misconduct and maladministration of this Government, as I honestly believe it was, then every fact connected with that rebellion, every fact which would tend to show what the cause of that rebellion really was, ought to have been submitted to the jury and the court, not as a justification, perhaps, but in order, if possible to mitigate the severity of the punishment which invariably follows a conviction for armed insurrection, and in order to offer reasonable basis on which the recommendation of the jury to mercy might have been justified. Not only had the counsel for the prisoner to encounter these difficulties, but they had others to encounter. It was stated at the trial, and it cannot be contradicted, that many of the witnesses subpoenaed by the prisoner were also subpoenaed by the Crown and those witnesses were warned to hold no communication with the counsel for the defence. Mr. Greenshields in open court—and this is not in the report of the trial—made this statement:

"The moment we approach them to speak to them they stand back as though we were tainted with the plague, and say: 'We are instructed to have no conversation with the defence.' Our endeavors to obtain information have been frustrated by the counsel for the prosecution or some one for the Government who have instructed every person not to recognize the counsel for the defence. The names of many of them were the names given by the prisoner as witnesses for the defence, but we were unable to see them, or to have any conversation with them, for what cause we do not know, but they said they were instructed not to have any conversation with us."

That is not denied by the counsel for the Crown, who made use of the following language in answer to the complaint made by Mr. Greenshields:

"My learned friend made some very strong and very inflammatory remarks about the treatment which he received from certain witnesses, whom he alleged were witnesses for the Crown. All that I can say is that if the counsel desire to interview a witness subpoenaed on the other side, they must always take their chances as to the reception they meet from those witnesses. That is a matter in their own judgment and in their own discretion about which they have no right to complain."

Now, after the statement we heard from the Minister of Public Works that the Government did everything they possibly could to make this a fair trial, it was a scandalous thing for the employes of the Government—not the counsel, for they would not be guilty of such a thing—to notify those witnesses subpoenaed by the prisoner and by the Crown to hold no communication whatever with the prisoner's counsel. Who gave the warning? Who is responsible for it? Will the Government tell? Whoever gave that warning, it was wholly unjustifiable, wholly improper, disgraceful in the extreme; and that, in itself, convinces me that this man had not a fair trial. There is another reason why I propose to vote for the motion of the Government on this occasion—I mean the motion to censure the Government for the execution of Louis Riel. The evidence given at the trial, and the documentary evidence produced there, lead my mind to but one conclusion—that Louis Riel surrendered upon the clear understanding that he was to receive protection, and that his life would be spared, that understanding being conveyed to him by those entrusted with the management of affairs in the Northwest. If that was so, to execute a man after a surrender so made, is, in my humble judgment, nothing more and nothing less than a judicial murder. Let us see how this theory is borne out by the facts. The general in command swore to the following statement at the trial:—

"On the 15th Louis Riel was brought in by two scouts, Hourie and Armstrong, and brought to my tent, and when he entered the tent, he produced a paper which I had sent to him, saving if he surrendered I would protect him till his case was decided by the Canadian Government."

Now, Sir, if General Middleton's story is correct, that he was to be protected till the Canadian Government decided his case, all I can say is that Louis Riel was laboring under delusions on more subjects than one. Why should Louis Riel have surrendered? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, or any man of common sense, if the General in command held out only an assurance that he would be protected until the Government decided his case? Why, Sir, we all know that the road to Dakota over the broad prairies of the west was as open to Louis Riel as it was to Gabriel Dumont and Michel Dumas, both of whom escaped the vengeance of the law; and why did Louis Riel remain in the country, and surrender? If he had seen fit not to remain, all the power and forces General Middleton had at his command could have no more arrested him than they did Gabriel Dumont and Michel Dumas. The fact that Louis Riel remained in the country and surrendered is consistent only with one of two theories—either that he believed that upon his surrender to the General in command he would not be executed, or that Louis Riel was as mad as a March hare; and on either theory I believe that Louis Riel should not have been executed. Now, let us see how the General's statement is borne out by the sworn testimony given at the trial. On the 12th of May—and I extract from the book submitted to Parliament—Louis Riel sent the following message to General Middleton at Batoche:—

"If you massacre our families, we are going to massacre the Indian agent and other prisoners.

"LOUIS DAVID RIEL,
per J. W. Astley, bearer."

On the same day the General sent the following to Louis Riel:—

"I am anxious to avoid killing women and children, and have done my best to avoid doing so. Put your women and children in one place, and let us know where it is, and no shot shall be fired on them. I trust to your honor not to put men with them.

"FRED. MIDDLETON,
Commander Northwest Field Forces."

On the same day Louis Riel sent, by the same messenger, the following communication to the General in command,:—

"Your prompt answer to my note shows that I was right in mentioning to you the cause of humanity. We will gather our families in one place, and as soon as it is done, we will let you know.

"LOUIS DAVID RIEL."

At this stage of the proceedings a person of the name of J. W. Astley appeared on the scene of action. He was called as a witness at the Regina trial. Let us see how his evidence supports the theory on which I have started, or how far it corroborates the statement of the General in command. J. W. Astley was examined as follows:—

"Are those words the words he wrote upon the envelope? A. Yes, he took the note out of my hands and wrote those words on the outside in my presence. He ordered the men who had left the rifle pits to go back again and they went back along with me; I continued on, went to the General and gave him the note. I did not call his attention to the memorandum on the outside of the note till night time. I asked him how the fire began and he said that the Sioux started it, but that if Riel would get his men to stop firing that he would order his men to remain where they were and they would not advance any further. There was not time to write a letter and I went back and it took a long time to find Riel."

There is one point that cannot fail to strike the mind here. Why should this correspondence have been carried on at all if there was not some expectation on the part of General Middleton that Riel would surrender? It is only consistent with the theory that the General was seeking to bring about a cessation of hostilities, in which effort I think he was to be commended, and in order to do that the surrender of Riel was invited. Astley further says:—

"I went among the women and children and I found him. The firing was getting warm. I told him what the General had said, that if he would order his men to stop the firing he would do the same, and that he could come with me personally to the General. He hesitated for a time. At last I said: 'There are not many minutes to waste if you want to call the council together; call them and let me address them.' At last the prisoner said: 'It is not necessary to call the council.' He said he would do as I wished. I said you acknowledge you have the power to do as I wish without the council. He said, yes. I said for him to give the order to stop firing. He said: 'You know the men I have. I cannot go among these men and tell them to stop firing.' He said: 'You know that.' I told him I would go back and explain how everything stood, and see if it was possible for the General to stop his men at a certain position if he was willing to do as I wished he was.

"Q. That is, willing to surrender?—A. Yes. I went back and told the General what he said. He said he could not accept it as a surrender unless Riel ceased firing. I knew he could not get his men to cease firing. I went back to try and keep the troops from getting at the women and children. I got the General to send a note to Riel offering the same terms as I had offered—that is, that he should be kept safe till he had a fair trial."

It appears that on the 13th May, 1885, General Middleton wrote a letter to Louis Riel, a letter which does not appear among the papers. What became of it, I do not know; but, at all events, we have the evidence of J. W. Astley of what took place just before Riel surrendered, and of the assurance he gave Riel. Let us see what they were:

"Q. Did he speak to you of his personal safety?—A. He had a very little to say about the halfbreeds, as far as regards himself seemed his principal object.

"Q. What did he ask you in regard to himself?—A. If I would explain what risk he ran personally himself. He said to me that we knew that he never carried a rifle, of course at the same time we had seen him carry a rifle on one occasion. I told him he ran no danger as I could look at it. He suggested that I should broach the subject of the church to the General, and it would give him a chance to broach the subject when he came to be interviewed by the General. He would say that he was not to blame, that the council was to blame."

Observe the evidence of J. W. Astley, a witness called by the Crown. He tells us that at the closing interview with Riel, before Riel surrendered, he told Riel that he ran no danger as far as he could see. Astley was the man who carried the messages from the General to Louis Riel and from Riel to the General; he was the go-between, and fresh from an interview with the General on the subject he assured Riel, a few minutes before the latter surrendered, that if he surrendered "there would be no risk as far as I could see it." On the strength of that assurance Louis Riel surrendered, and sent the following note to General Middleton:—

GENERAL,—I have received only today yours of the 13th instant. My council are dispersed. I wish you would let them quiet and free. I hear that presently you are absent. Would I go to Batoche, who is going to receive me? I will go to fulfil God's will.

LOUIS "DAVID" RIEL,
Ex ovede.

15th May, 1885.

Therefore, I say, with every confidence in the soundness of my argument, that the documentary evidence produced and the evidence of J. W. Astley establish clearly the fact that Louis Riel surrendered to Gen. Middleton upon the assurance that he would be perfectly safe. To execute a man in the face of that solemn declaration of one of the Crown witnesses appears to my mind to be nothing else than a judicial murder. That is not all. This view of the matter is still further confirmed by an article which appeared in the *Mail*, the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, on the 14th April, 1885, a month before Riel surrendered,—and I have no doubt the paper must have reached him in the ordinary course of the mail shortly before he surrendered, and that he read the article. The article was a clear exposition of the policy of the Administration upon this question. It was a direct invitation to the halfbreeds and to Louis Riel to surrender, and held out the promise that if they did, no more blood would be spilt upon the field of battle or the scaffold. The *Mail* said:

"The news from the West this morning is not sensational at all. Of course it must be obvious that men do not take up arms and fight and kill and risk being hanged and shot, like Riel and his followers, without at least a conviction that they have grievances."

I would advise the hon. the Minister of Public Works to re-construct the *Mail* newspaper. It gives the clearest possible evidence of the criminality and mismanagement of hon. gentlemen opposite:

"These grievances will have to be heard some day, and the sooner the public understands the better.

"An unreasoning cry for blood and revenge would be a misfortune. Fighting for the mere sake of fighting, or for revenge, is a poor business, and our people will be best pleased with a bloodless, if successful, campaign.

"The idea that Riel will run away as on a former occasion, is one that is useful to keep the Indians quiet; but it is not one on which a military policy can be framed. If he is forced to fight he will do so. If he offers to submit no doubt wisdom will guide the deliberations of those who will have charge of the negotiations. General Middleton, no doubt, has large powers, and is continually in communication with the authorities at Ottawa."

True, and I have shown you that General Middleton had opened negotiations with Riel, through J. W. Astley, a friend of the Government in the Northwest Territories. I have shown you that J. W. Astley informed Riel that he would be perfectly safe if he surrendered. In view of all these facts, the execution of Riel appears to me to have been wholly unjustified. I go a step further, and I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works, as the hon. the First Minister is not in his place, if he can point me to a single case in the history of England, within the last hundred years, where a political offender, who surrendered himself to the Government, was executed. I defy him to point me to a single case in the history of England, or any other civilized country, in which, within the last hundred years, a political offender, surrendering conditionally or unconditionally, was executed by the Government. The hon. gentleman can find no such case. It remained for this Government, which deceived and misled and used harshly the halfbreeds of the Northwest, to set an example of bad faith and ministerial atrocity that appears to me to be unparalleled in the history of civilization. You may find a precedent in the case of Thebaw, the late King of Burmah, or His Majesty the King of Dahomey, or some other foreign potentate of that description, but you will find no example of such conduct in the history of the British Empire. There is another ground upon which I propose to justify the vote I am about to give. The jury who tried Louis Riel and convicted him recommended him to the mercy of the Crown. That recommendation must have been based upon one of two grounds, or perhaps two. Either that the rebellion in the Northwest was provoked, caused, and incited by the maladministration, misconduct and criminal neglect of this incompetent Administration, or that Riel was not responsible for his action. The Government disregarded the recommendation, they realized, as the counsel for the Crown and judge presiding at the trial realized, when the evidence was offered and rejected to show that the halfbreeds of the Northwest Territories were improperly used, that, if that evidence was received, the Government of this country would be arraigned for their misconduct, and that the conviction of Louis Riel would be equivalent to an acquittal of this Government. The Government further fully realized, and nobody better than the Minister of Public Works, that the acquittal of Louis Riel would be tantamount, in the estimation of thinking and reasonable men, and of the great body of electors of this country, to a condemnation of this Government; and so, to save their own necks, they executed Louis Riel. It was a harsh, an unheard of, and an unjustifiable proceeding, in modern days, particularly in a case of high treason, to execute a man who was recommended to the mercy of the Crown by the jury which tried him. It was a proceeding which was unwarranted by what was disclosed at the trial at Regina, and which was unwarranted by any subsequent proceedings that I am aware of. It was a thing unparalleled in the history of the United States of America or of the British Empire for the last 50 years. I shall refer to a few cases upon this subject. It is true that what were called the Cato street conspirators, Thistlewood, Ings, Brente Davidson and Tidd, were executed in 1820 for high treason, but neither of those were recommended to the mercy of the Crown, as you will find by a reference to the trial, and neither received mercy at the hands of the Crown. Of the Nottingham rioters, who were tried in 1817 for high treason, 20 were convicted; the sentence of death was passed upon them all, and three who were ringleaders were executed, but those ringleaders were convicted without the jury recommending them to the mercy of the Crown. The remaining 17 were recommended to the mercy of the Crown, and received that mercy at the hands of the Imperial Government. Of the Monmouth rebellion in 1839, the ringleaders were arrested and tried, John Frost was convicted, John Frost was sentenced to death, John Frost was recommended to mercy by the jury that tried him, and John Frost received at the hands of his sovereign the mercy and the clemency of the Crown. Zephaniah Williams and William Jones were tried in 1840 for high treason in the same outbreak; they were found guilty, sentenced to death, recommended to mercy by the same jury that found them guilty, and a humane Government, not actuated by pressure from without by an unseen and irresponsible power, carried out the recommendation of the jury and their sentences were commuted. Charles Walters, John Lovell, Richard Benfield, John Rees and Jenkin Morgan were convicted in 1840, were sentenced to death and the sentences of all were commuted. In 1848, Meagher, the Irish rebel, was tried, convicted, sentenced to death and his sentence commuted. In the same year Wm. Smith O'Brien was tried for high treason, convicted, sentenced to death, recommended to mercy, and the mercy of the Crown was extended to him. Unfortunately, in this case, the jury did not state the grounds upon which they recommended the prisoner to the clemency of the Crown, they were not asked to do so at the trial and they did not do so. But we have evidence from the organs of the Government of the reason why three of these jurors did recommend Louis Riel to the mercy of the Sovereign. The correspondent of the *Mail* newspaper, writing from Regina on the Monday after the trial, makes use of the following language:—

"I saw three of the jurors, who told me that in their opinion Riel should not be hanged, as they think that, while he is not absolutely insane in the ordinarily accepted meaning of the word, he is a very decided crank."

And the *Mail* newspaper itself, commenting on that, says:

"They (the jury) themselves say that by their recommendation to mercy they meant that the Crown should spare the wretched man's life, as in their opinion he is not wholly sane. They are satisfied that he knows the difference between right and wrong, but believe him to be subject to delusions which warp his moral sense. This is their interpretation as given to our correspondent at Regina, and they must be supposed to know their own minds."

This is what the *Mail* itself says. Its special correspondent, interviewed three jurymen and declared that they did not think Riel was quite responsible. Another juryman, I think, over his own signature, stated that he recommended Louis Riel to mercy because the halfbreeds were provoked to rebellion by the maladministration and misconduct of the Government. If it were based upon the ground of insanity, then there was a double reason why the clemency of the Crown should have interfered. First, there was the ground of the misconduct of the Government which provoked the rebellion, and, secondly, there was the ground of the man's irresponsibility. Another juryman, who was an Englishman and a Protestant, as they were all Protestants on the jury at the trial, made use of the following language:—

"The unanimous desire of the jury in recommending the accused to the clemency of the Crown, was that he be not put to death."

I ask again: Were the Government aware of these facts? I say they were. They take the *Mail* newspaper, they read it diligently, most of them swear by it, and, being aware of these facts, I say they ought not to have allowed the sentence to be carried into execution. I saw that a newspaper published in Montreal, which used to support the Government, but which I believe is not quite in harmony with them now, challenged the Government the other day to deny if they dared the following allegation:

"But, it will be asked, did Sir John and his Government know of this desire, this object of the jury in recommending Riel to mercy? We answer, and say yes. Sir John and his Orange crew knew all about it, and their knowledge was obtained directly from the jury itself. We are in a position to prove that after the trial of Riel was concluded and the verdict rendered, the jury took special measures to carry to Government at Ottawa the real and exact sense and meaning of their verdict, so that there could possibly be no error or deception about it. They gave the Government to understand that by their verdict they did not want Riel hanged, as, under the circumstances, they were unanimously of opinion that he did not deserve to incur the extreme penalty of the law. But Sir John ignored everything to yield to Orange clamor, and Riel was sacrificed to please the Orange Moloch. Is that charge plain enough? We think it is, and we defy Sir John and his Government to deny the facts as we have just set them forth."

Are these facts true? I believe they are. In that case the punishment which this Government deserves at the hands of the people of this country for having provoked and caused and incited this rebellion would be merely nominal in comparison with that which they should receive at the hands of an indignant people and an honest parliament for having executed a man under such circumstances as these. There is still another reason why I propose to justify the vote I am about to give. Although I am not a medical man, I profess sometimes to practise law, and I propose to justify the vote I am about to give on the ground that Louis Riel, at the time he committed the offences with which he was charged, was laboring under certain delusions. I know quite well that this question has challenged discussion during the past few months in the press and out of the press, among medical men and among laymen, and among public men on the platform, and we know that it has been challenged on the floors of Parliament. Impressed with the gravity of the questions involved in the trial of Louis Riel's insanity, I can honestly say that I endeavored to bring my own mind to the investigation of the facts, and the examination of the law, free and unbiased. I endeavored, Mr. Speaker, when I entered upon this investigation, to enter into a covenant with myself that my utter want of confidence in this Government, my entire sympathy with the halfbreeds in the Northwest territories in their long, their earnest and their gallant struggle with the Government of this country to secure their rights, should not mislead my own mind or warp my judgment. At all events, I honestly entered upon the investigation of the evidence and the consideration of the law, and I have honestly arrived at the conclusion which I am about to affirm with my vote. There is a popular misapprehension as to the rule that ought to prevail in criminal cases when insanity has been set up as a defence. The popular opinion is that if a man is able to distinguish right from wrong he is held responsible for violation of law. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is an entire misapprehension of the law. A man may be able to distinguish right from wrong, a man may be perfectly rational upon every subject but one, and if he commits an offence within the scope and limit of that subject, then in the eye of the law he is not responsible. Now, I observe that the Minister of Public Works has fallen into this error in discussing this question. I say there is no excuse for him, and there is no excuse for the Minister of Justice if they they have fallen into that error. It is an error in which it appears to me the medical commission sent up to investigate the mental condition of Louis Riel have also fallen; because I observe that after they pronounced that he was suffering under two delusions, they say he was perfectly responsible. I say it is not a proper rendering of the law, I say it is not the law of the land. If it can be shown that a man is sufferfng under a mental hallucination or delusion, and he commits an offence within the scope of that delusion, I say that the merciful provisions of the British and Canadian law exempts him from responsibility; and I am going to fortify that position with the authority of writers on the subject and with decisions in the courts of England. Wharton and Stille, in their work upon medical jurisprudence, vol. 1, page 122, lay down the following law:—

"That the 'right and wrong' test does not cover all the cases of legitimate insane responsibility. Medical observation, based on an induction which each year makes at once more extended in its materials and more absolute in its results, tells us that there are persons unquestionably insane who are capable of being instructed in the law of the land, of knowing what the law is, both in its general character, and in its results, and of being deterred by proper sanction from breaking such law,"

The text-writer further says:

"The defence of insanity is further sustained when there is an insane delusion from which the crime emanates, and when being insane the defendant is forced to the act by an irresistible impulse, he in each case knowing the act is forbidden by the law of the land."

The text-writers further say that the test is:

"Did the defendant know enough to distinguish right from wrong as to the particular case; if he did not, he is to be acquitted."

The text-writers still further say;

"Any species of insane delusion exempts from punishment the perpetrator of an act committed under its influence."

At page 155 they further say—after speaking of the responsibility in some cases of those partially insane:

"But it is otherwise with insanity accompanied with delusions of such a character that the patient believes he is authorized by superior power to dispense with the law of the land, and with insanity one of whose elements is an impulse to commit crime which the reason is unable to resist. If there be such phases of insanity as these, it is clear that their objects are not responsible to the ordinary process of penal justice. Yet such patients the 'right and wrong' test might pronounce sane. In such cases this test cannot be exclusively applied."

Then the text writer speaks of the nature of some of the delusions which exempts from punishment a crime committed under their influence. For instance:

"A man imagines himself to be the Grand Lama or Alexander the Great, and suppose that his neighbor is brought before him for an invasion of his sovereignty, and he cuts off his head or throttles him. He knows he is doing wrong, perhaps from a sense of guilt he conceals the body, he may have a clear perception of the legal consequences of his crime, and yet, according to Wigan on insanity, edition of 1874, page 65, the man would not be responsible."

I say that is a clear exposition of the law. A man may be responsible, may be clear-headed, may be rational upon every subject but one, and if he commit an offence within the scope of this one, he is not responsible. Woodman and Tidy, in their work upon Forensic Medicine, page 837, speaking of the different types of insanity, say:

"The principal forms of monomania are: 1. Monomania of ambition."

Mark you—"ambition."

"2. Religious monomania. 3. The monomania of persecutions. 4. The monomania of wrongs or grievances suffered from private parties or from the Government."

Now let us see for a single moment how the evidence given at the trial fits into this general defence of insanity, to these delusions, the effect of which is to exempt from responsibility a man who commits crime under their power. I do not propose at this moment to discuss the medical evidence or the expert testimony, although I shall shew shortly that it preponderates in favor of the theory of his insanity. It must not be forgotten, however, that the question we have to discuss is not what his condition was at the time of his execution, but whether he was laboring under these delusions at the time the offence was committed. If he was sane at the time these offences were committed but insane at the time he was executed, he aught not to have been executed; and if he was laboring under these delusions at the time these offences were committed, he ought not to be hanged. If in fact he were insane, either when the offences were committed or insane when he was executed, then the Government of this country did wrong in hanging him. Dr. Willoughby, who was called as a witness for the Crown, says:—

"Q. What did he say as to the Government of the country?—A. They were to have a new Government in the Northwest. It was to be composed of God-fearing men. They would have no such Parliament as the House at Ottawa." I certainly think that on that point, at least, Louis Riel was not insane.

"Q. Anything else?—A. Then he stated how he intended to divide the country into seven portions.

"Q. In what manner?—A. It was to be divided into seven portions, but as to who were to have the seventh I cannot say.

"Q. You mean to say you cannot say how these seven were to be apportioned?—A. Yes. He mentioned Bavarians, Poles, Italians, Germans, Irish. There was to be a new Ireland in the Northwest * * *

"Q. What was that?—A. As Riel was leaving he expressed an opinion. He stated they would have no Orangeism in the Northwest. I said I hoped by Orangeism he did not mean Protestantism. He turned excitedly and said he was glad I mentioned it, that he certainly understood the difference between Protestantism and Orangeism, and he then spoke of the different religions and beliefs, and illustrated it by the example of a tree. The true church was the large branch of the tree, and the others as they departed from it, got weaker, up to the top of the tree. * * *

"Q. Would you now indicate to us the different people he expected to assist him?—A. The Irish of the United States, the Germans, the Italians, Bavarians and Poles, and Germany and Ireland.

"Q. We have had Germany and Ireland twice?—A. Well be put it twice. He put the Irish and Germans of the United States; then Germany itself was to come into line."

This is the evidence as to the condition of Louis Riel long before the outbreak. Does anyone mean to tell me that a man entertaining those delusions was perfectly rational and responsible. That is not all. Charles Nolin is called, Let us hear what he has to say—and remember he is one of the witnesses for the Crown:

"The witness is asked whether he ever heard the prisoner speak of his internal policy in the division of the country, if he should succeed in his enterprise, and he says yes. He says that after his arrival the prisoner showed him a book written with buffalo blood, and the witness said that the prisoner in that plan said after taking England and Canada, he would divide Canada and give the Province of Quebec to the Prussians, Ontario to the Irish, and the Northwest territories be divided into different parts between the European nations. He says he does not remember them all, but the Jews were to have a part. The witness also says that he thinks he also spoke of the Hungarians and Bavarians. He says that he thought the whole world should have a piece of the cake, that Prussia was to have Quebec.

"Did the Prisoner speak about his plans, and if so, what did he say?—A. About a month after he arrived, he showed me a book that he had written in the States. What he showed me in that book was first to destroy England and Canada.

"Q. And?—A. And also to destroy Rome and the Pope.

"Q. Anything else?—A. He said that he had a mission to fulfil, a divine mission, and as a proof that he had a mission, he showed a letter from the Bishop of Montreal eleven years back."

"Q. "Did he say how he would carry out his plans?—A. He did not say how he would carry out his plans then."

Then we have the evidence of Thomas

(continued on fourth page.)