

culty, and that the amnesty would surely be granted.

The delegates accepted this promise of honor and the Governor General, Sir John Young, telegraphed to Lord Granville, 'Negotiations with the delegates closed satisfactorily.'

'That on the 19th of the same month of May the Governor General of Canada, at his residence, in presence of Sir George E. Cartier, renewed to the delegates the assurance that the amnesty would be undoubtedly granted. Still more, that the said amnesty would reach Manitoba before the arrival of the Lieutenant Governor of the Province, and that while awaiting its publication, he, the Governor General, would give orders that no annoyance would result to any one of those implicated in the troubles of 1869 and 1870.

I have signed after reading had been done.

(Signed) NOEL J. RITCHOT.

'Sworn before me on the nineteenth day of November, 1873, at Montreal.

(Signed) NAR. VALOIS, J. P.

Such a declaration sworn to by a person of the position and character of Rev. N. Ritchot should suffice alone, and it is easily understood that it can but strengthen my conviction when added to so many other evidences, that the amnesty has been promised in the name of Her Majesty.

The very fact of negotiating with the "Delegates of the North West" with the approbation of the Imperial Government, demonstrates that the proclamation of the Governor General, which had been handed to me by command of His Excellency on the 17th February, 1870, had obtained its full effect in England, and ought to be sufficient throughout the Dominion to protect all and every one of those connected with the Red River difficulties, whatsoever may be their names or the share of responsibility they have assumed.

The proclamation of Sir John Young having been neither revoked nor modified, held good when I arrived at Fort Garry and continued so when I handed it to those it concerned. This document has lost nothing of its weight since, if I may judge by the words of the Governor General himself.

In an interview with His Excellency at Niagara, on the 23rd of July, 1870, I expressed the desire to have a renewed declaration of amnesty. The Governor General pointing to his proclamation, exclaimed:—"Here is my Proclamation, it covers the whole case." As I insisted on having something more explicit,

owing to the doubts expressed by some parties concerning the same proclamation, the Governor General requested me to write to him on the subject. I did so, and the following written at Hamilton was addressed to His Excellency, at Niagara, and merely intended to obtain a renewed and more explicit promulgation of amnesty, for the satisfaction of those whom I had mentioned to the Governor General, and who doubted the meaning of his first proclamation, though it was quite sufficient for me; as I was perfectly satisfied that the amnesty had been positively promised.

HAMILTON, 23rd July, 1870.

To His Excellency Sir John Young, Governor General of the Dominion of Canada:

May it please Your Excellency to allow me to communicate the following observations relative to the Red River difficulties:

1st. I desire to resent the odious calumnies lavished on me in certain newspapers. I protest before God and before men against those accusations. The part I took in the Red River troubles consists merely in the pain they caused me; in the efforts made to the best of my judgment, to quell them; and in the desire to see the whole concur to consolidate the noble institutions by which we are governed by forming a close and indissoluble union between Canada, the land of my birth, and the Northwest, that of my adoption.

2nd. I regret as much as any one, the deplorable deeds perpetrated; nevertheless, I dare affirm that it is impossible to form an impartial judgment of the same, without being acquainted with all the circumstances that have given rise to them, and such information it is very difficult for outsiders to obtain. Three men lost their lives during the troubles; the first I may say accidentally, as Parisien who shot him was not sound in mind. Parisien himself, arrested before the sad event by the so called loyal party, was afterwards killed by them, or rather left for dead and in fact died in consequence of the horrible treatment they had inflicted on him. No mention is made of the death of these two men; but, instead, some of those who most largely contributed to the death of the latter, thinking to thereby display their loyalty, loudly called to revenge the last victim, the unfortunate Thomas Scott. Any one acquainted with the events, is less astonished at the death of Scott, than at the fact of there being but one victim in the insurgent quarters. This fact clearly proves that the armed party was neither