

say, when they shall determine that malice was in the heart, yet that it must in this case be done, as "it is the intent of the mind which constitutes the crime," and elucidated the position by again putting a case hypothetically. "If the conversation in the canoe (page 301, et seq.) was heard by M'Lellan, and without malice, or ill intention towards Keveny, he neglected to give information of the design, then he would be guilty of concealment, but would not be an accessory, for it is the wicked design, the ill intention, which constitutes the crime." It was then explained, that this was an offence (viz. *misprision of murder*) which the law punished, and sometimes severely too, and adverting again to this conversation: "But, gentlemen, (said his Honour) if on the other hand, as commanding officer of this canoe, he not only heard the conversation, but approving of it in his heart, he neglected, from a malicious intention, to prevent the crime, then, gentlemen, he is guilty of what he is accused in the indictment. He is an accessory to the murder, and in law equally guilty, and liable to the same punishment as the principal." The Chief Justice cautioned the Jury against imagining that he had any intention of supposing that this was the case of M'Lellan, observing, that in passing a verdict: "It is you (the Jury) who are to say, and you only, whether it was an omission to perform a duty, arising from no motive of malice or ill-will to the deceased, or whether he consented in his heart from malicious motives." Adverting to the suggestion previously made by the Court, it was observed that, if the Jury took a similar view of the evidence, the charge of accessory after the fact would perhaps be laid aside altogether, but to decide that point, it would be necessary to ascertain correctly what in law constituted the offence. Referring to *Hawkins' Pleas of the Crown*, established that, "the rescue of a felon from arrest," and "the voluntary suffering him to escape," were that crime, and that some held "those in like manner guilty who opposed the apprehending a felon;" and from the same authority it was shewn, that "suffering a felon to escape without arresting him on the bare concealment of a felony, do not make a man an accessory."

The Chief Justice then noticed the following "very peculiar circumstances in this case"—that there was no magistracy in the Indian territory; the great and (as he believed) only outlet from that territory was in possession of Lord Selkirk, namely, the forcible detention of Fort William, was considered hostile to the interests of the North-West Company; and remarked: "It seems, I think, that he had a knowledge of the felony having been committed, and he brought De Reinhard to Lac la Pluie, whether with an intention to bring him to Fort William, and then to send him to Montreal, where he might have been tried, will be for you to determine. It will be for you to con-