

not go beyond the law, and if a man has had the full benefit of the law—for the law as it stands on the statute book is the test of fairness—he has had a fair trial. But I find in this respect the honorable gentleman is absolutely and positively in contradiction with his own chief. The leader of the Opposition made a speech some time ago in the city of London, where a banquet was given him on his return from England, and, speaking on this very subject, he said :

“ I think it right to say that, in my opinion, the Government acted in a very proper spirit in providing for the attendance of the prisoner's witnesses, and, from what I know of the leading counsel, I should think it impossible that in their management of the case there was anything unfair to the prisoner or derogatory to the high character they deservedly enjoy in the responsible duties they undertook to perform.”

(Loud cheers.) The honorable gentleman, however, said that there was one great element of unfairness in the trial—that his trial had taken place before a jury composed exclusively of Protestants. Would the honorable gentleman have wished that Riel upon that occasion should have been tried by a jury composed exclusively of Catholics? What a howl would have gone throughout the length and breadth of the country if at that time Louis Riel, who was an apostate from his Church, was at variance with the authorities, who had committed many acts of cruelty, of sacrilege and other acts which it will be my duty to mention in the course of this speech, had been put upon trial before men whose faith he had trampled on, whose Church he had desecrated, and whose most cherished convictions he had despised and spurned. (Cheers.) What was the statement of that unfortunate man in the course of the speech that he addressed to the jury upon that occasion? I hold in my hand the official report of that trial; and at page 150 I find the infamous language that that unfortunate man used to the venerable Archbishop who had brought him up, clothed him, fed him and educated him. He spoke of him, and in reference to one of the witnesses, a Mr. Ness, he said :

“ One of the witnesses here, George Ness; I think, said that I spoke of Archbishop Tache and told him that he was a thief. If I had had the opportunity I proposed I would have questioned him as to what I said so that you would understand me. I have known Archbishop Tache as a great benefactor, I have seen him surrounded by his great property, the property of a widow whose road was passing near; he

bought the land around and took that way to try and get her property at a cheap price. I read in the gospel: ‘Ye Pharisees with your long prayers devour the widows.’ And as Archbishop Tache is my great benefactor, and as he is my father I would say, because he has done me an immense deal of good, and because there was no one who had the courage to tell him, I did, because I love him, because I acknowledge all he has done for me. As to Bishop Grandin, it was on the same grounds. I have other instances of Bishop Tache, and the witness could have said as the Rev. Father Moulin:—‘When you speak of such persons as Archbishop Tache you ought to say he made a mistake, not that he committed robbery.’ I say that we have been patient a long time, and when we see that mild words only serve as covers for great ones to do wrong, it is time when we are justified in saying that robbery is robbery everywhere, and the guilty ones are bound by the force of public opinion to take notice of it. The one who has the courage to speak out in that way, instead of being an outrageous man, becomes, in fact, a benefactor to those men themselves and to society.”

We have also heard from the last speaker that the recommendation to mercy had been entirely ignored: Before I get through with my observations I may refer to some other cases, in which a much stronger recommendation has also been overlooked; and I can say, having had considerable experience myself in matters of that kind, and from what I have read, that this recommendation to mercy is in a great measure just, as the hon. Minister of Public Works has expressed it—a desire on the part of the jury to relieve themselves to some extent of the responsibility for the verdict which they gave, and throw that responsibility through that means on the shoulders of the Executive. But we have also heard from the hon. gentleman that this unfortunate man Riel had given himself up to General Middleton, and that therefore he should be free—that therefore he should never have experienced the sad fate which befel him. Why, sir, do we not all know, have not we all lived through these troubles, have not we all seen what took place, and is it not in the memory of every man that Riel was not on that occasion afraid of the trial that was to come, on the part of the Dominion Government, but was afraid that he would be murdered on the spot by the indignant volunteers—was afraid not only of the whites who were there, but was afraid, and perhaps still more afraid, of the dire vengeance of the half-breeds whom he had deceived? (Loud cheers.) The last point to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and referred at very great length, was with reference to the in-