

charge of partisanship because we condemn the execution of Riel. But their ravings will not drive us from the path of honor and of duty. We still adhere to the view that to satisfy Orange vengeance Riel was executed, please or displease this statement whom it may. The Catholic journalist has, we fully understand, a difficult course to follow. We know by experience that in seeking to act as our conscience tells us we should act, we have made enemies, but this neither alarms nor affrights us, for well do we remember the lines of Charles Mackay:

You have no enemies, you say
Alas! my friend, the host is poor;
He who has mingled in the fray
Of duty, that the brave endure,
Must have made foes: if you have none,
Small is the work that you have done:
You've hit no traitor on the hip,
You've dashed no cup from perjured lips,
You've never turned the wrong to right,
You've been a coward in the fight.

"Oath" affects to treat the *Canadian Freeman* with contempt. That respectable and independent journal can afford to despise this puny effort at severity. The *Freeman* has in this crisis done its duty nobly and will never be forgotten by the Irish Catholics of Canada. But unkind as is the anonymous sycophant in the *Mail* to the *Freeman*, he is still more so to the *Irish Canadian*. He does not consider that journal even worthy of mention. And yet the *Irish Canadian* has been as severe as any of the other journals he effeminate in its assaults on Orangemen. In its issue before the last we find a sledge-hammer demolition of that society:

"The Orange Order can lay no claim to an exclusive monopoly of loyalty; its brethren are not a whit more loyal than others, who are never heard bawling about what they have done and are prepared to do; and as to the peace and welfare of the community, it is a remarkable fact that where the Orange element is in the ascendant, there turmoil and strife are certain to be found. A political organization to all intents and purposes, its leaders are ever on the watch for the 'main chance'—ever on the look out for No. 1—and they make the rank and file subservient to their own ends. Where they can control they make their power felt, whether it be in Parliamentary or Municipal affairs; and none can share the boodle except those who belong to the lodge." A "good, sound Protestant," who is not of the lodge, may sometimes get at their hands political preferment; but the Papist has no show whatever. And the worst of it is, that in many instances it is the Papist vote that secures power for the Orangemen. This may sound strange; but it is absolutely true that of the sixteen Orangemen of this Province who now hold seats in the House of Commons, several so hold by the good-will and pleasure of Catholics. Yet the very men for whose return to Parliament Catholics worked earnestly and effectively were not ashamed the other day to demand of Sir Alexander Campbell that he forthwith cancel the appointment of a Catholic, which had just been made by one of his colleagues.

"We think a crisis in this matter has been reached. When we find the Catholics of Ontario shut out from Parliamentary representation—shut out from the Judiciary, the list of sheriffs, of registrars and county attorneys—shut out from the higher offices with their ample salaries; and when, in addition to all this, we find the Orange serpent (not satisfied with stifling the Catholics of this Province whenever and wherever it could) attempting to fasten its fangs on Ireland through those who are laboring in her cause here, we see but one course that can be pursued by any man with an ounce of Irish Catholic blood in his veins. The Orangemen have shown that they are our implacable foes; and that they are also the unrelenting enemies of Ireland. They have done us all the injury they could, and will do us more if they can. Let us put it out of their power to do us further harm; and let us punish them for the harm they have already done us. This we can do very easily and very simply."

"When gentlemen of the Gink type—who believe in home rule for themselves but not for others—challenge the Catholic body offensively, unfairly and insultingly, the gauntlet should be picked up promptly and the battle begun. In every case where a choice is made by ballot—be it an election for Parliament or a municipal election—the Catholic should be careful in marking his ticket. If there be on the ticket the name of a candidate who is an Orangeman, his vote is to pass that name by, and vote for the candidate who is not an Orangeman, whatever else he may be. A plan like this, rigidly adhered to at every polling booth in the Province, would in a short time shear the members of the Orange order of the greater part, if not all, of their political strength. It would do more: it would teach them a lesson which they would never forget—teach them that those who play with fire run risk of being burned. The time is opportune for a test like this; and we can win if we be united. It is not a question of politics; it is whether the Catholics of Ontario shall any longer submit to the injustice and indignity heaped upon them by a secret, oath-bound cabal—a cabal whose oath binds all its members to undying hostility to Catholics and their religion. Every Orange lodge in this Province is the focus whence emanates the decree which rejects the Catholic and denies him participation in the public life of the country. We can do no less than reciprocate the kindness by voting steadily and solidly against every Orangeman who presents himself for our suffrage till we have seen the last of them."

Can it be possible that "Oath," who appears to have taken the entire English-speaking Catholic press of the country under tutelage, is ignorant of the existence of the *Irish Canadian*? Or can it be that, cognizant of its existence, he does not deem it worth notice? Or can it be, again, that cognizant of its existence and of its course on the Riel execution and its severe but just denunciation of the Orange body, he puts faith in the rumor that Mr. Boyle has been "instructed" from Ottawa

to change front on the subject and has consented to obey the "instructions" from headquarters?

A PLEASANT VISIT.

His Lordship the Bishop of London, who, accompanied by the Rev. Dr. Coffey, left this city on Saturday last for Ottawa, remained over Sunday in Toronto, the guest of the Very Rev. F. P. Rooney, V. G., pastor of St. Mary's. On Sunday morning at seven, His Lordship celebrated Mass in the beautiful chapel of Loretto Abbey. During the Holy Sacrifice several hymns of a most devotional character were rendered with exquisite skill and deepest feeling by the pupils. After mass His Lordship addressed the young ladies, in one of the reception rooms of the convent, a few words expressive of the pleasure he felt at visiting Loretto Abbey. In the chapel of that institution, he had, he said, celebrated his first mass after receiving official notification of his appointment to the See of London. In that house also had he written his first pastoral to the clergy and laity of his diocese. He was not, therefore, a stranger at the Abbey, however unknown he might be to many of those present. He thanked them cordially for the beautiful hymns in which they had, during the Holy Mass, sung the praises of the Most High. After imparting the pupils his episcopal blessing, His Lordship conveyed to his youthful hearers the announcement that he gave them a whole day's holiday, an announcement received with gladest demonstrations of welcome and gratitude. The Bishop having put the question as to when they should have the holiday, it was unanimously and enthusiastically resolved that it should be enjoyed on the following day. A brief visit to the young ladies' art studio followed. The specimens of their artistic skill and taste in painting, drawing and embroidery, in all the varied forms and developments of these accomplishments, were very deservedly admired. The number of pupils in attendance at the abbey is now two hundred and thirty, of whom nearly half are boarders. This worthy institution is one of the brightest of Toronto's many educational ornaments, and one also of the very foremost seats of Christian female education in America. Its present prosperity gives, we would fain believe, but small indication of the great things yet in store for Loretto Abbey.

At 11 o'clock mass was celebrated in St. Mary's church by Vicar General Rooney. His Lordship the Bishop of London, for many years rector of this church, preached an earnest and powerful discourse on the coming of Christ. The people of St. Mary's were delighted beyond expression to have amongst them their former venerated pastor and hear once more his familiar and eloquent voice.

After reading the gospel of the day, the Bishop depicted the state of the world before the advent of the Redeemer. Sin had degraded the whole human race, and though, when Christ did come, the Roman empire could boast of a certain civilization, it was a civilization of mere material and not of moral refinement, enlightenment and development. It was a civilization that consecrated the principle that might is right—a civilization that deified wealth and exalted poverty. There were in ancient Rome 600,000,000 of slaves. The working-man under that system bore the shackles of servitude on his limbs and its brand on his brow. He had no civil, social or political status. Christ came to establish, and did establish another system, a system of moral regeneration. He promised heaven itself to the poor and the suffering. To the beggar, Lazarus, He opened a haven of delight in the bosom of Abraham, and to the haughty and unfeeling Dives he awarded everlasting misery. The gospel of Christ was one of mercy, peace and forgiveness. His teachings, His miracles and His parables all attest this truth. Hence should all men be grateful for His coming and prove their gratitude by living in accordance with His maxims and precepts.

At the conclusion of his sermon, His Lordship referred in touching terms to the happy reminiscences that his visit brought to mind. There were, no doubt, some there who remembered his ministrations amongst them, but many who formed part of the parish of St. Mary's eighteen years ago were now absent. Some had gone to their great account, others had left for strange lands and distant places. A new generation had sprung up since his consecration as Bishop of London and his departure from Toronto. But St. Mary's and its parishioners were still dear to him. His Lordship, after paying a feeling tribute to the late lamented and venerated Father Proulx, said that he was delighted that the parish of St. Mary's had passed under the care of his friend, Vicar-General Rooney, a model priest and faithful friend. He asked of his hearers the assistance of their prayers and concluded by imparting them his blessing. In the afternoon the par-

fashions in great numbers called on the Bishop of London. The old people shed tears of joy on finding their former pastor amongst them, but especially of having an opportunity of once more grasping his hand and kneeling for his blessing.

His Lordship's memories of his residence in Toronto are certainly of a vivid and pleasing character. Father Rooney is now engaged in the construction of a new church in keeping with the needs of the times and the growth of the city—a growth truly marvellous, especially within the past few years. We wish him and his good people every success in this their undertaking, entered upon to better promote God's glory and the salvation of souls.

SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL'S REPORT

Elsewhere will be found Sir Alex. Campbell's report on the question of Riel's execution. Anxious that our readers should hear both sides of the question, we give the document in full. Sir Alexander not only omits no argument that could be advanced in favor of the execution, but marshals his statements with remarkable force and persuasiveness. A very careful perusal of the document does not alter our view of the case. But as we have already given at length the reasons that urge us to believe that the best interests of the country would have been served by the commutation of Riel's sentence into imprisonment for life, we deem it but fair to afford our readers the fullest opportunity of considering for themselves the reasons that actuated the government to pursue the course it saw fit to adopt.

THE IRISH TRIUMPH.

The triumph of the Irish party all along the line is the great distinctive feature of the present electoral campaign in the United Kingdom. The national party has literally swept the country from sea to sea—routing Whig and Tory, Orange and "Catholic" loyalists. Nothing is left of the once powerful Irish Liberal party, while the proud and haughty Tories are humbled to the very dust. Disloyalty to Ireland has been by an indignant people trampled under foot, Whigism killed, Toryism crippled for life, and landlording as a political factor effaced. A new Ireland has sprung into being, an Ireland spirited and independent, an Ireland even greater than that to which Gratton bowed down to exclaim, *Edo perditus*. The Irish people all over the world feel proud of their brethren at home. Their conduct throughout the campaign just closing, their unity, subordination, and respect for law prove them to be a people admirably adapted to the exercise of self-government. We rejoice at Ireland's manifestation of her constitutional strength. A little while and she will invite mankind to join in her gladness because her long lost Parliament has been restored.

EDITORIAL NOTES:

THE REV. FATHER O'CONNELL, the respected and zealous pastor of Mount Forest, writes us in these encouraging terms: "I would like very well to see the RECORD a weekly visitor to every family in my mission." We thank our reverend friend for this kind wish, and will endeavor to further deserve his commendation and encouragement.

His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto on Sunday last reblessed and dedicated the new completed church of Port Colborne, of which Rev. Father Kilcullen is pastor. On Tuesday His Grace presided at an ordination ceremony in St. Mary's church, in the city, and on Wednesday left for Kingston to assist at Bishop Cleary's celebration of his fifth anniversary of consecration.

THE AMERICAN thus speaks of James Curry, American Minister to Spain:—"The choice of this gentleman as our minister seems to have been nearly as unhappy as that of Mr. Kelley for Italy. He made a speech in Richmond some years ago in which he denounced Catholicism as 'worse than cannibalism,' and as a cancer eating into the vitals of the countries of southern Europe. Our Roman Catholic contemporaries are justified in their suggestion that Dr. Curry could serve his country better at home, than as our representative to a Catholic nation."

THE CATHOLIC body in Liverpool is numerically strong and, when united, able to make a gratifying exhibit at the polls. In the Dublin *Freeman's Journal* we read:—"The result of the Liverpool School Board elections shows a veritable triumph for the Catholics. Of the fifteen successful candidates one Catholic takes three places, another fifth, three others seventh, eighth, and ninth, and another twelfth place. An analysis of the voting shows that the Roman Catholics have gained one seat, and now constitute the strongest party on the Board. The Church party lose the seat which the Roman Catholics gain, and the Nonconformists are in relatively the same position as before the election. The new Board consists of six Roman Catholics, five Churchmen, and four Nonconformists. The voting shows the following totals: Church of England, 138,574; Roman Catholics, 130,351; Nonconformists, 95,771; other candidates, 9,010—or a total vote of 373,706. The perfection of the Roman Catholic organization, says the *Liverpool Daily Post*, enabled them to use to the best advantage their entire polling strength."

THE HANGING OF RIEL.

LETTER FROM M. TARTÉ.
Quebec, 4th December, 1885.

To the Editor of the *Mail*.
Sir,—The great interests that are now at stake—a spirit of harmony between races, and, consequently, the maintenance of confederation—give me the right, I believe, of making another effort to prove that you are mistaken on the nature of the agitation that is in progress in this Province. The point which I want to establish, the opinion which I would like you to share, are that in asking for the commutation of the sentence passed upon Riel, and in protesting against the penalty of death which he had to suffer, the majority of my fellow-countrymen has exercised a right which is guaranteed to all of us by the constitution. We might be wrong; but it is our undoubted right to act as we do, the moment we think we are acting justly in so doing. In other terms, the pretension that Lower Canada seeks to put itself above the law because a so-called French-Canadian was involved, constitutes a great injustice towards us. Here is the manner in which you resume your opinion:

"In a word Lower Canada sets up the doctrine that she has a right to punish the executors of the law, whoever they might be for the time being, whenever they suppressed a criminal of whose guilt or sanity she was not absolutely convinced. And the *Mail* said that it was a proclamation of race ascendancy that could not be tolerated, etc."

The constitutional doctrine, you know as well as I do, is that the government is but a committee of the House, to which it is bound to account for each and every one of its actions. The execution of Riel is an act of the Government, for which it is responsible to Parliament and the people of Canada. Then it is the undoubted right of any elector to condemn the government for that act, if he thinks that the said act has been detrimental to public interest.

Sir John A. MacDonald's government has not done what you say, execute the law: there is no law that obliges it to put Riel to death; it has decided that Riel should be hung. Read the Statute of the Dominion, 43 Victoria, Chapter 25, section 76.

"When any person is convicted of a capital offense and is sentenced to death, the Stipendiary Magistrate shall forward to the Minister of Justice full notes of the evidence with his report upon the case; and the execution shall be postponed from time to time by the Stipendiary Magistrate, if found necessary, until such report is received and the pleasure of the Governor thereon is communicated to the Lieutenant-Governor."

That is what has taken place in Riel's case. Judge Richardson has forwarded his report, the pleasure of the Governor-General-in-Council has been manifested by rescripts, and finally by the execution of Riel. I repeat it: the law did not oblige the Government to order the execution of Riel; it was in the Government's power to execute or to not execute the prisoner.

It is then evident, and there can be no doubt about that, that you ignore the most elementary principles of responsible Government when you deny us the right of condemning, if we think proper, those who are responsible for Riel's execution. In so doing, we do not put ourselves above the law, much less do we wish to proclaim the supremacy of our race over the English element.

We are within our attributions of judges in the last resort of the acts of a Government. We are in our right and, excuse me, if I tell you so, you are in your wrong when you declare that if we do not set aside our opinions, you will strive to punish us, even if you have to resort to civil war. You would not find in this whole empire a constitutional jurist to defend the theories which you want us to admit.

We are quite willing to discuss the motives by which the Government has been actuated, and if proofs are given showing that we have taken the wrong route, we will have no objection to admit that we are in the wrong. But we will not let the British flag to protect us; convincing arguments, reasons of a superior order shall be received most respectfully by us. But those reasons, if they exist, give them. I have mentioned the example given by the United States who have pardoned Sitting Bull; of England proclaiming in 1858 an amnesty in India to which all had a right who had not been previously implicated in the murder of British subjects. By your silence you admit the force that Sitting Bull's case has in the argument, and you fall in a grave historical error in seeking to nullify the precedent of India, which is so conclusive. You say:

"In the first place it is not true to say that the precedent set by England in dealing with the Indian mutiny has been regarded by the Canadian Government in dealing with the North-West rebellion. When the backbone of the mutiny had been broken, an amnesty was proclaimed to all save those who had been guilty of actual murder. Similarly at Batoche and Battleford, no ordinary rebel has been punished for simply bearing arms. But the amnesty in India did not cover the case of the ringleaders. On the contrary, if a Native Sahib should be caught to-morrow, assuming that he is still alive, he would undoubtedly be executed though nearly thirty years have elapsed since Cawnpore. Mr. Tarte may say that the Nana was a murderer, whilst Riel, who let loose the Indians upon defenceless settlers, was not. Tantia Topee was not a murderer, however, but a rebel chief who displayed great valor, yet he was tried by the summary process of court-martial and hanged."

Contrary to your pretension, Sir, the amnesty in the case of the India rebellion was given to all those whose hands were not tainted by the blood of subjects of Her Majesty. I have the honor to lay before you the following section of Queen Victoria's proclamation of amnesty:

"Our clemency will be extended to all offenders, save and except those who have been or shall be convicted of having directly taken part in the murder of British subjects. With regard to such,

the demands of justice forbid the exercise of mercy.
"To those who have willingly given asylum to murderers, knowing them to be such, or who may have acted as leaders or instigators in revolt, their lives alone can be guaranteed; but, in apportioning the penalty due to such persons full considerations will be given to the circumstances under which they have been induced to throw off their allegiance."

But that is not all: Her Majesty's Government admitted that, in the case of the Indian revolt, the legitimate complaints of certain chiefs should be taken into consideration. The Governor-General of India having, by a proclamation dated 4th March, 1858, declared that the properties of the rebels who resided in the province of Oude were thereby confiscated, Sir James Outram, Commissioner-in-chief, strongly objected to the rigorous measures proposed, on the principle that the conduct of the Government towards the proprietors of land had been reprehensible.

"He is of opinion that the land holders were most unjustly treated under our settlement operations, &c."
Had we nothing to reproach ourselves with in our conduct towards the half-breeds? Was not our policy of colonization unjust towards them, at least in certain instances?

All impartial men will admit that there is a great deal of similitude between the Indian revolt and Riel's case, with the exception that the former was of a far more serious nature. Notwithstanding, Her Majesty granted an amnesty to all involved, excepting the murderers.

Did you carefully study Tantia Topee's case? Here is what I find in "Ball's history of the Indian Mutiny."

"Revolt as were his crimes, he attempted neither palliation nor extenuation. He gave no mercy and he sued for none; stern and relentless to the last, he yielded up his life without a murmur or a struggle, betraying as little symptoms of nature or humanity on the scaffold at Sepree, as he must have done by the well at Cawnpore. He denied having taken any part in the massacre; but it is known that he commanded at the time, one of the divisions of the Nana Sahib's army, &c., &c."

You are acquainted with the horrible scenes of Cawnpore, scenes in which the Nana and his principal lieutenants, as Tantia Topee, had taken part. You also know that Tantia Topee, who had been handed over to the English by Maun Sing, was immediately tried by court martial and sentenced to be hanged.

General Middleton wrote to Riel saying that he would protect him, as well as the members of his Council, until he would be handed over to the Government.

It is, then, evident, that there is not the slightest analogy between Tantia Topee and Riel.

Our Province never asked, never dreamt of asking that Riel should escape punishment. Condemning as you do the faults of which he has been guilty, we say that the federal authorities have inflicted upon him a penalty which is no more applied by civilized nations to crimes of the kind committed by him, and public opinion inclined to the belief that the government was not actuated by motives of general interest, and to that is due the deep emotion under which the people labored. Under the circumstances of a similar nature, any other Province of the Confederation would have acted in the same way.

I admit that there has been excesses of language: all popular movements are tainted with those inconveniences; some of our orators have spoken inconsiderately, but they have never attacked the constitution, nor have they provoked any disparagement of the law of the land. The Government has been denounced in terms that were both severe and violent: the words "national party," "union," &c., have been uttered against Sir John A. MacDonald. Those who went the furthest are Messrs. Laurier and Mercier—two of the leaders of the liberal minority of Lower Canada. And it is the words uttered by those two gentlemen that you have chosen in preference to those which were both severe and violent: institutions which benefit the Anglo-Saxon minority as well as they benefit us.

Your Montreal correspondent has complained of the position in which the English of the Province are placed. That reproach is as painful to my fellow-countrymen as that which accuses us of striving to put ourselves above the law. You will find very few Englishmen of good standing to countenance such a language.

We see here what cannot be said in any of the other provinces; counties exclusively French and Catholic returning members of parliament who are English Protestants. Our English fellow citizens form about a fifth of the population of the Province; yet, of the six ministers which constitute the provincial cabinet, two, Messrs. Lynch and Robertson, are representatives of the English-Protestant element. The Irish have one representative in the person of M. Flynn, and the French-Canadians have but three representatives. That is to say, that the English-speaking population which is composed of about 250,000 souls, has as many representatives in the cabinet as have the French-Canadians who number 1,250,000.

Does this look like exclusion? If we were disposed to establish what you are pleased to call the supremacy of our race, would we act in such a liberal manner?

The same proportion exists in the distribution of public offices. I take the liberty of laying before you, in your own language, these lines which I wrote some time ago:

"In the following fifteen departments of the Civil Service:
"The Legislative Council;
"The Legislative Assembly;
"The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery;
"The Law Clerk;
"The Lieutenant Governor;
"The Provincial Secretary;
"The Registrar;
"The Attorney-general;
"The Treasurer;
"The Accountant;
"Crown Lands Department;
"Department of Agriculture;

"Department of Public Instruction;
"Railway;
"Inspection of public office.

"In those fifteen branches of the civil service the salaries of the French-Canadian employees amount to \$110,450, while the salaries of the employees of English origin amount to \$42,750, that is to say that our fellow citizens of British origin draw very near the half of the sum paid to the officers of French-Canadian extraction."

Are those facts and figures of a kind to convince you that in protesting against the action of the government, we had in view the maintenance of that supposed system of domination over the English, and the desire of establishing what the *Mail* calls the tyranny of the minority?

You have brought up as proof of our ill-will against the English, the fact that on the night of Riel's execution, the windows of the office of the *Morning Chronicle* had been broken. About twenty drunken boys were guilty of that vile action, against which I have entered my protest, in the name of my fellow countrymen, in the number of the *Canadian* published on the following morning. Facts of that kind happen in the best organized communities and, Sir, you have only to look at old and calm England to see that scenes of disorder of a far more grievous nature, have been enacted in several electoral districts during the last few days.

You would not have lived six months in the midst of our population, of that I am convinced, before you would be prepared to admit that nowhere in her domains the Queen has subjects more tolerant, more anxious to see good order prevail and more loyal to the British Crown, but at the same time more proud and more jealous of their rights. The people of our Province have firmly believed that the execution of Riel would not have taken place, if French blood had not flown in his veins. Deeply wounded, our population has formulated its protest. You shall see, I believe, that when the question will be discussed before Parliament, the members of Lower Canada had received assurances which they, in their turn, gave to their electors, assurances which provoked a violent clamor when the news of the execution was received. The electors bitterly accused their representatives of having deceived them. In answer, the members accused the ministers of duplicity. All may have been in good faith, but the fact is there, and I call your attention to it, so that you may well understand the reasons why the political atmosphere of our Province has been disturbed. Nothing humiliates me more than the accusation which you formulate that my countrymen as well as I, are trying to make a hero of Riel.

If some soreheads or some politicians have evoked the memory of the patriots of 1837 to defend Riel's conduct, you shall not find, thank God, anything in my writings or in my speeches that will allow you to believe that I ever dreamt of such a comparison. And, Sir, I here express the opinion of all right-thinking men of my province: Ever since the breaking out of the rebellion of the Saskatchewan, I have written that Riel's case was not our cause, and that our duty was to help the Government in suppressing the movement.

The only question at issue between us is that of the punishment. I believe that I have on my side the English and American precedents, the ideas that are now current.

On the other hand, you think that the public good and the peculiar circumstances in which the North-West is placed, necessitate that measures of an extraordinary severity be taken. Our opinions are open to discussion. I may be right, you may be wrong, and vice versa. If we disagree, let us do as British citizens, worthy of the institutions which grant us the liberties of speech, of the parliamentary vote and of the press, should do. Do not deny me the right of judging the actions of the councillors of the Crown, as you have already done, as well as the *Canadian* has done in the course of a very remarkable article, I admit. It is not the Crown who is involved: it is those who the people have intrusted with the care of advising the Crown. I persist in thinking that, though severe, punishment, though severe, would have best served the interests of our country, and that the Government would have acted more wisely if it had inspired itself of the doctrines exposed in the following terms by Chitty:

"Every citizen should even patiently endure evils which are not insupportable, rather than disturb the public peace. A denial of justice on the part of the sovereign, or affected delays, can alone excite the furious transports of a people whose patience has been exhausted, and even justify them, if the evil be intolerable, and the oppression great and manifest. But what conduct shall the sovereign observe towards the insurgents? I answer, in general,—such conduct as shall at the same time be the most consonant to justice, and the most salutary to the state. Although it be his duty to repress those who unnecessarily disturb the public peace, he is bound to show clemency towards unfortunate persons, to whom just causes of complaint have been given, and whose sole crime consists in the attempt to do themselves justice: they have been deficient in patience rather than fidelity."

But the sentence rendered against Riel has been carried out. Whatever may be our opinions, it is the duty of each and every one of us to prevent the demagogues of taking possession of the condemned man's corpse to use it as an arm against the constitution and the welfare of the Dominion. I have the honor to be,

Sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. ISRAEL TARTÉ.

SEVERAL typographical errors unavoidably crept into our article of last week entitled "The RECORD sustained." Our readers must, however, have at once perceived them, and understood what should have been the exact tenor and wording of our statements.