

that he had tried to induce Crowfoot, one of the leaders of Indians, to rise in rebellion. We have undoubted proof that he tried to kindle an Indian war in 1879-80; we have also the evidence of Father André, which establishes beyond the possibility of discussion, that the motives of Riel in the agitation were interested, personal motives, and that he stated he was perfectly prepared to give up the Metis cause provided his claims against the Government were satisfied. We have, further, the very important piece of evidence, to my mind, that on the 2nd February, two months before the outbreak, Sir John sent a despatch to Nolin, which was communicated to Father André and to Riel, about the settlement of Metis matters. In this despatch there was no mention of indemnity to Riel, who, in consequence of this, decided to take up arms. We have all this evidence, which cannot be controverted, to show how far this man was deserving of the pedestal on which he is placed to-day as a hero before the people of Canada. Who forgets what an enormous amount of influence the sermon delivered by Father Dowd had upon the population of this country? Here is a gentleman who, being outside of all party questions, outside of any political consideration, having merely at heart the interest of his own people, states positively that he has had an interview with Bishop Grandin, and says:

"He had enjoyed the privilege of a personal interview with His Lordship Mgr. Grandin, Bishop of the North-West Territory, the scene of the late rebellion. From His Lordship's own lips he had heard the recital of all the atrocities that had been committed by the pagan Indians and easily deceived half-breeds, urged on by a bad and unscrupulous man; how poor missionaries had been butchered almost under His Lordship's eyes; how the half-breeds had been led to revolt not only against the Government of the country, but under their wicked leader had been induced to abandon their faith and turn their backs on the devoted clergy to follow that leader who wished to set aside Pope and Church, and all authority, ecclesiastical and civil."

But, Sir, there is more. In all that has been done by this unfortunate man, I think nothing was more deserving of the fate that followed his acts than the manner in which he tried to get the Indians to join in the troubles. I hold in my hand a letter addressed by Poundmaker and other Indians, dated, Cut Knife Hill, April 29th, 1885.

"To Mr. Louis Riel:

"I want to hear news of the progress of God's work. If any event has occurred since your messengers came away let me know of it. Tell me the date when the Americans will reach the Canadian Pacific Railway. Tell me all the news that you have heard from all places where your work is in progress. Big Bear has finished his work; he has taken Fort Pitt. 'If you want me to come to you let me know at once,' he said, and I sent for him at once. I will be four days on the road. Those who have gone to see him will sleep twice on the road. They took twenty prisoners, including the master of Fort Pitt. They killed eleven men, including the agent, two priests and six white men. We are camped on the creek just below Cut Knife Hill, waiting for Big Bear. The Blackfeet have killed sixty police at the Elbow. A half-breed who interpreted for the police, having survived the fight, though wounded, brought this news. Here we have killed six white men. We have not taken the barracks yet, but that is the only entire building in Battleford. All the cattle and horses in the vicinity we have taken. We have lost one man, a Nez Percé, killed, he being alone, and one wounded. Some soldiers have come from Swift Current, but I don't know their number. We have here guns and rifles of all sorts, but ammunition for them is short. If it be possible, send us ammunition of various kinds. We are weak only for the want of that. You sent word that you would come to Battleford when you had finished your work at Duck Lake. We wait still for you, as we are unable to take the fort without help. If you send us news, send only one messenger. We are impatient to reach you. It would encourage us much to see you, and make us work more heartily. Up to the present everything has gone well with us, but we are constantly expecting the soldiers to visit us here. We trust that God will be as kind to us in the future as He has in the past. We, the undersigned, send greeting to you all.

(Signed),

"POUNDMAKER,  
"OOPINOW-WAY-WIN,  
"MUSSINAS,  
"MEE-TAY-WAY-IS,  
"PEE-YAY-OHEW."

This letter is, to my mind, of very great importance, because it shows what really were the dangers which we were exposed to at the hands of that man. Now, I will address myself to another part of this case. I want to ask any hon.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

member who has followed this matter up, whether the Government have gone out of their way, whether they have gone out of any ordinary course of law to punish Riel? Have we not followed the laws which have been passed by this very Parliament? Have we not during the whole of the trial, as far as it was possible for the Government to do, met in every way the requests which were made to us by the counsel for the defence? The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), the other day, in addressing this House, stated that the trial had been an unfair one. I do not know how the hon. gentleman can say that this was an unfair trial, in any case he and his friends certainly do not agree on that subject. I read in a speech delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition in London his appreciation of the manner in which the trial was conducted, and I see that he states there:

"I think it right to say that, in my opinion, Government acted in a proper spirit in providing for the attendance of the prisoner's witnesses; and that, from what I know of their 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, or the responsible duties they undertook to perform. I am not implying, then, any present doubt as to the justice of the trial. For all my enquiries, it may have been perfectly just. Besides justice, in fact, the creation of a feeling of public confidence, of a general impression that all was fair and that every security was taken for fairness is important, and, in that view of the duties of the authorities, I think these questions should be examined."

But there is more than this, however high an authority this may be. There is also the testimony of one of the counsel for the defence—the testimony of Mr. Fitzpatrick, who in Montreal was interviewed, I believe, by a reporter of the *Star*. In the course of that interview he stated that the trial had been a fair trial, that it had been conducted as fairly as it was possible to be under the circumstances. As I stated yesterday, the responsibility which we had to take was a very considerable one, and I think that every hon. member here and every man outside of this House who really takes to heart the interest of Canada will consider that, in a matter of that importance, it became the bounden duty of the Government to consider what would be in the future the result of the course which we were following. Looking to the future of Canada and in the interests of that future, it seems to me that the head, the one who had got up two rebellions within such a comparatively short period, two rebellions which had cost so much treasure to Canada and so many valuable lives, should suffer the penalty of the crime which he had committed. It was important to teach, with a view to the future, those who had some supposed grievance, or who, believing that they had a grievance, imaginary or real, could simply follow the example given them by Riel in trying to do justice to themselves by taking up arms against the Government and the constitution. Such an example as has been given by this unfortunate man, who has paid the penalty of his high crime, certainly will teach others in the future that if they follow such an example they will become liable to the same fate, and that at any cost the constitution and the institutions of this country must be maintained and protected at all hazards. Nobody will doubt, I am sure, how deeply we felt the nature of the frightful penalty of death which it was our duty to sanction; but, Sir, the example of not only this country, but almost every other country, teaches us that that frightful penalty is, after all, the only means which society has of protecting itself against those who would attack it, and who refuse to respect the law and the constitutions which are established for the protection of society. Twice, Mr. Speaker, had Riel raised the standard of revolt—in 1870 and 1885. Now, I ask any reasonable man, inside or outside of the House, whether we would not have been recreant to our duty if we had allowed him to go on unpunished after a repetition of the rebellion which he had organised in 1869-70? Would we not almost have been inviting him to organise a third rebellion? Would we not have set an example