cerning those things which are matters of opinion, it will be lawful, with moderation and with a desire of investigating the truth, without injurious suspicions and mutual incriminations. For which purpose, lest the agreement of minds be broken by temerity of accusation, let all understand: that the integrity of the Catholic profession can by no means be reconciled with opinions approaching towards naturalism or rationalism, of which the sum total is to uproot Christian institutions altogether, and to establish the supremacy of man, Almighty God being pushed on one side. Likewise it is unlawful to follow one line of duty in private and another in public, so that the authority of the Church shall be observed in private, and spurned in public. For this would be to join together things honest and disgraceful, and to make a man fight a battle with himself, when on the contrary he ought always to be consistent with himself, and never in any the least thing or manner of living decline from Christian virtue. But if inquiry is made about principles merely political, concerning the best form of government, of civil regulations of one kind or another, concerning these things, of course there is room for disagreement without harm. Those whose piety therefore, is known on other accounts, and whose minds are ready to

ACCEPT THE DECREES OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE,

justice will not allow accounted evil because they differ on these subjects; and much greater is the injury if they are charged with the crime of having violated the Catholic faith, or are suspected, a thing we deplore done, not once only. And let all hold this precept absolutely who are wont to commit their thoughts to writing, especially the editors of newspapers. In this contention about the highest things, nothing is to be lett to intestine conflicts or the greed of parties, but let all uniting together seek the common object of all to preserve religion and the State. If therefore there have been dissensions, it is right to obliterate them in a certain voluntary forgetfulness; if there has been anything rash, anything injurious, to whomsoever this fault belongs let compensation be made by mutual charity, and especially in obedience to the Apostolic See. In this way Catholics will obtain two things most excellent: one that they will make themselves helps to the Church in preserving and propagating Christian knowledge; the other that they will benefit civil society; of which the safety is gravely compromised by reason of evil doctrines and inordinate desires.

These things, therefore, Venerable Brethren, concerning the Christian constitution of States and the duties of individual citizens, We have dwelt upon; We shall transmit them to all the nations of the Catholic world.

But it behoves Us to implore with most earnest prayers the heavenly protection, and to beg of Almighty God these things which We desire and strive after for His glory and the salvation of the human race, Whose alone it is to illumine the minds and to quicken the wills of men and Himself to lead on to the wished for end. As a pledge of the Divine favours, and in witness of Our paternal benevolence to you, Venerable Brethren, to the Clergy, and to all the people committed to your faith and vigilance, We lovingly bestow in the Lord the Apostolic Benediction.

Given in Rome, at St. Peter's, on the first day of November, in the year of Our Lord MDCCCLXXXV., of Our Pontificate the Eighth.

LEO. PP. XIII.

REVIEW OF RIEL'S CASE.

An Official Memorandum Prepared by Sir Alexander Campbell.

ALL THE POINTS CONSIDERED.

From our own Correspondent.

Ottawa, Dec. 2.—The following is a full copy of a memorandum respecting the case of The Queen v. Riel, prepared at the request of the Committee of the Privy Council by Sir Alexander Campbell the Minister of Justice in charge of the case:—

The case of Louis Riel, convicted and executed for high treason, has excited unusual attention and interest, not merely in the Dominion of Canada but beyond its limits. Here it has been made the subject of party, religious and national feeling and discussion; and elsewhere it has been regarded by some as a case in which, for the first time in this generation, what is assumed to have been a political crime only has been punished with death. The opponents of the Government have asserted that the rebellion was provoked, if not justified, by their maladministration of the affairs of the North-West Territories, and inattention to the just claims of the half-breeds. With this question, which has been made one of party politics, it is not thought becoming to deal here. Upon such a charge, when made in a constitutional manner, the Government will be responsible to the representatives of the people, and before them they will be prepared to meet and disprove it. Appeals to the animosities of race have been made in one of the provinces with momentary success. Should these prevail, the future of the country must suffer. Parliament will not meet for some time, and in the interval, unless some action is taken to remove these animosities, they will gain ground, and it will become more difficult to dispel belief in the grounds which are used to provoke them. It is thought right, therefore, that the true facts of the case, and the considerations which have influenced the Government, should be known, so that those who desire to judge of their conduct impartially, may have the information which is essential for that purpose.

It has been asserted that the trial was an unfair one, and before a tribunal not legally constituted; that the crime being one of rebellion and inspired by political motives, the sentence, according to modern custom and sentiment, should not have been carried out, and that the prisoner's state of mind was such as to relieve him from responsibility for his acts. After the most anxious consideration of each one of these grounds the Government have felt it impossible to give effect to any of them, and have deemed it their duty to let the law take its course. I am now desired, in a matter of such grave importance and responsibility, to place on record the considerations which have impelled them to this conclusion:

THE FAIRNESS OF THE TRIAL.

(1.) As to the jurisdiction of the court and the fairness of the trial.

It should be sufficient to say that the legality of the tribunal by which he was tried has been affirmed by the Privy Council, the highest court in the Empire, and has seemed to them so clear that the eminent counsel who represented the prisoner could not advance arguments against it which were thought even to require an answer. It has been said that a jury composed of six only, and the absence of a grand jury, are features so inconsistent with the rights of British subjects that the prisoner had still ground of complaint; but, as was pointed out in the Privy Council, the same crime may be tried elsewhere in the British Empire, notably in India, without any jury, either grand or petty, and this mode of trial has been sanctioned by the Imperial Parliament. It is to be observed also, that the offence was tried in the country in which it was committed, under the law as it then existed and had existed for years, and that this is a course of which no offender can fairly complain, while it is a right to which every criminal is entitled. Of the competency of the court, which had been affirmed by the full court in Manitoba, the Government saw no reason to entertain doubt; but having regard to the exceptional character of the case, the usual course was departed from in the prisoner's favour, and a respite was granted, to enable him to apply to the ultimate tribunal in England, and thus to take advantage to the very utmost of every right which the law could afford to him.

The fairness of the trial has not been disputed by the prisoner's counsel, nor challenged either before the Court of Appeal in Manitoba or the Privy Council. It has, on the contrary, been admitted, not tacitly alone by this omission, but expressly and publicly. It may be well, however, to state shortly the facts, which show how the duty which the Government fully acknowledged both to the public and the prisoner has been fulfilled. It was most desirable not only to ensure the impartial conduct of the trial, which would have been done by the appointment of any barrister of known standing, but to satisfy the public that this had been effected; and in view of this the prosecution was entrusted to two leading counsel in Ontario, known to be in sympathy with different political parties. With them was associated a French advocate of standing and ability in Quebec, and the personal presence and assistance of the Deputy Minister of Justice was given to them throughout the proceedings. The procedure adopted and the course taken at the trial, to be now shortly stated, as it appears on the record, will show that every opportunity for the fullest defence was afforded; and it is needless to add, what is well known and recognized, that the prisoner was represented by counsel whose zeal and ability have made it impossible to suggest that his defence could in any hands have been more carefully or more ably conducted.

THE ACCUSED'S POSITION.

The charge was made against the prisoner on the 6th of July, 1885, and the trial was then fixed to take place on the 20th of that month, of which the prisoner was duly notified. On the same day a copy of the charge, with a list of the jurors to be summoned and of the witnesses to be called, was duly served upon him, the Crown waiving the question whether this was a right which could be claimed, and desiring, as far as possible, to afford every privilege which, under any circumstances or before any tribunal, he could obtain, and which, consistently with the procedure otherwise prescribed in the Territory, could be granted to him. On the day named the prisoner, having been arraigned, put in a plea to the jurisdiction, to which the Crown at once demurred, and this question was then argued at length. The grounds taken by the prisoner's counsel had been in effect decided unfavourably to their contention by the Court of Queen's Bench in Manitoba in a recent case, and the presiding judge held that it was therefore impossible for him to give effect to them. This decision having been announced, the prisoner, by his counsel, then demurred to the information, which was alleged to be insufficient in form, and this demurrer having been argued, was also overruled.

The prisoner then pleaded not guilty, and his counsel applied for an adjournment until the next day, to enable them to prepare affidavits on which to apply for a further postponement of the trial; and, the Crown not objecting, the court adjourned. On the following day, July the 21st, the prisoner's counsel read affidavits to the effect that certain witnesses not then present were necessary for the defence, and that medical experts on the question of insanity were required by them from the Province of Quebec and from Toronto. They represented that the prisoner had not had means to procure the attendance of these witnesses, and desired an adjournment for a month, during which they would be able to obtain it.

In answer to this application, of which the Crown had had no notice until the day previous, the Crown counsel pointed out that these medical witnesses, as well as some others in the North-West Territories who were wanted, could all be got within a week; and they offered not only to consent to an adjournment for that time, but to join with the prisoner's counsel in procuring their attendance, and to pay their expenses. The counsel for the prisoner accepted this offer, which the presiding judge said was a reasonable one, and the trial adjourned until the 28th. In the meantime the witnesses were procured. They were present and were examined for the prisoner, and their expenses were paid by the Crown, the medical gentlemen being remunerated as experts at the same rate as those called for the prosecution. The other grounds which had been urged for delay were not further pressed. The court met on the 28th. No further adjournment was asked for, and the trial proceeded continuously until it was concluded on the 1st of August. The exceptional privilege accorded to persons on trial for treason, of addressing the jury after their counsel, was allowed to the prisoner and taken advantage of.

OPINIONS OF THE MANITOBA JUDGES.

As to the general character of the tribunal, and the ample opportunity afforded to the prisoner to make his full defence, it may be well to repeat here the observations of the learned Chief Justice of Manitoba in his judgment upon the appeal.

"A good deal," he remarked, "has been said about the jury being composed of six only. There is no general law which says that a jury shall invariably consist of twelve, or of any particular number. In Manitoba, in civil cases, the jury is composed of twelve, but nine can find a verdict. In the North-West Territories Act the Act itself declares that the jury shall consist of six, and this was the number of the jury in this instance. Would the Stipendiary Magistrate have been justified in impannelling twelve when the statute directs him to impannel six only? It was further complained that this power of life and death was too great to be entrusted to a Stipendiary Magistrate. What are the safeguards? The Stipendiary Magistrate must be a barrister of at least five years' standing. There must be associated with him a justice of the peace and a jury of six. The court must be an open public court. The prisoner is allowed to make full answer and defence by counsel. Section 77 permits him to appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench in Manitoba when the evidence is produced, and he is again heard by counsel, and three judges reconsider his case. Again, the evidence taken by the Stipendiary Magistrate, or that caused to be taken by him, must, before the sentence is carried into effect, be forwarded to the Minister of Justice; and sub-section eight requires the Stipendiary Magistrate to postpone the execution from time to time, until such report is received, and the pleasure of the Government thereon is communicated to the Lieut.-Governor. Thus, before sentence is carried out the prisoner is heard twice in court, through counsel, and his case must have been considered in Council, and the pleasure of the Governor thereon communicated to the Lieutenant-Governor. It seems to me the law is not open to the charge of unduly or hastily confiding the power in the tribunals before which the prisoner has been heard. The sentence, when the prisoner appeals, cannot be carried into effect until his case has been three times heard, in the manner above stated."

The evidence of the prisoner's guilt, both upon written documents signed by himself and by other testimony, was so conclusive that it was not disputed by his counsel. They contended, however, that he was not responsible for his acts, and rested their defence upon the ground of insanity. The case was left to the jury in a very full charge, and the law, as regards the defence of insanity, clearly stated in a manner to which no exception was taken, either at the trial or in the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba, or before the Privy Council.

RIEL'S SANITY.

(2.) With regard to the sanity of the prisoner and his responsibility in law for his acts, there has been much public discussion.

Here again it should be sufficient to point out that this defence was expressly raised before the jury, the proper tribunal for its decision; that the propriety of their unanimous verdict was challenged before the full court in Manitoba, when the evidence was discussed at length and the verdict unanimously affirmed. Before the Privy Council an attempt was made to dispute the correctness of this decision. The learned Chief Justice of Manitoba says in his judgment:—"I have carefully read the evidence and it appears to me that the jury could not reasonably have come to any other conclusion than the verdict of guilty. There is not only evidence to support the verdict, but it vastly preponderates." And again:—"I think the evidence upon the question of insanity shows that the prisoner did know that he was acting illegally, and that he was responsible for his acts."

Mr. Justice Taylor's conclusion is:—"After a critical examination of the evidence, I find it impossible to come to any other conclusion than that at which the jury arrived. The appellant is, beyond all doubt, a man of inordinate vanity, excitable, irritable, and impatient of contradiction. He seems to have at times acted in an extraordinary manner; to have said many strange things, and to have entertained, or at least professed to entertain, absurd views on religious and political subjects. But it all stops far short of establishing such unsoundness of mind as would render him irresponsible, not accountable for his actions. His course of conduct indeed shows, in many ways, that the whole of his apparently extraordinary conduct, his claims to Divine inspiration and the prophetic character, was only part of a cunningly devised scheme to gain, and hold, influence and power over the simple minded people around him, and to secure personal immunity in the event of his ever being called to account for his actions. He seems to have had in view, while professing to champion the interests of the Metis, the securing of pecuniary advantage for himself." And he adds, after reviewing the evidence:—"Certainly the evidence entirely fails to relieve the appellant from responsibility for his conduct, if the rule laid down by the judges in reply to a question put to them by the House of Lords in MacNaghten's case, 10 Cl. & Fin. 200, be the sound one."

Mr. Justice Killam says:—"I have read very carefully the report of the charge of the magistrate, and it appears to have been so clearly put that the jury could have no doubt of their duty in case they thought the prisoner insane when he committed the acts in question. They could not have listened to that charge without understanding fully that to bring in a verdict of guilty was to declare emphatically their disbelief in the insanity of the prisoner." And again:—"In my opinion the evidence was such that the jury would not have been justified in any other verdict than that which they gave. * * * I hesitate to add anything to the remarks of my brother Taylor upon the evidence on the question of insanity. I have read over very carefully all the evidence that was laid before the jury, and I could say nothing that would more fully express the opinions I have formed from its perusal than what is expressed by him. I agree with him also in saying that the prisoner has been ably and zealously defended, and that nothing that could assist his case appears to have been left untouched."

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.

The organization and direction of such a movement is in itself irreconcilable with this defence; and the admitted facts appear wholly to displace it. The prisoner, eight months before this rebellion broke out, was living in the United States, where he had become naturalized under their laws, and was occupied as a school teacher. He was solicited to come, it is said, by a deputation of prominent men among the French half-breeds, who went to him from the North-West Territories, and, after a conference, requested him to return with them, and assist in obtaining certain rights which they claimed from the Dominion Government, and the redress of certain alleged grievances. He arrived in the Territories in July, 1884, and for a period of eight months was actively engaged in discussing, both publicly and privately, the matters for which he had come, addressing many public meetings upon them in a settlement composed of about six hundred French and a larger number of English half-breeds, together with others. The English half breeds and other settlers observed his course, and saw reason to fear the out break which followed; but the suggestion of insanity never occurred, either to those who dreaded his influence in public matters over his race, and would have been glad to counteract it, or to the many hundreds who unhappily listened to him and were guided by his evil counsels to their ruin.

If, up to the eve of the resort to arms, his sanity was open to question, it is unaccountable that no one, either among his followers or his opponents, should have called public attention to it. If the Government had then attempted to place him under restraint as a lunatic, it is believed that no one would have been found to justify their action, and that those who now assert him to have been irresponsible would have been loud and well warranted in their protest. It may be well also to call attention to the obvious inconsistency of those persons—not a few—who have urged the alleged maladministration of the affairs of the North-West Territories by the Government as a ground for interfering with the sentence, without ceasing to insist upon the plea of insanity. The prisoner cannot have been entitled to consideration both as the patriotic representative of his race and an irresponsible lunatic. It may be asked, too, if the leader was insane, upon what fair ground those who were persuaded by and followed him could be held responsible; and if not, who could have been punished for crimes which so unquestionably called for it.

It has been urged, however, that his nature was excitable, and his mental balance uncertain; that as the agitation increased his natural disposition overcame him, and that the resort to violence was the result of over-wrought feeling, ending in insanity, for which he cannot fairly be held accountable—that, in short, he was overcome by events not foreseen or intended by him. A simple statement of the facts will show that this view is wholly without foundation; that throughout he controlled and created the events, and was the leader, not the follower: and that the resort to armed violence was designed and carried out by him deliberately, and with a premeditation which leaves no room whatever for this plea.

RIEL'S ACTIONS AND MOVEMENTS.

The first collision with the troops occurred at Duck Lake, on the 26th of March, 1885.

On the 3rd of March previous the prisoner was at a meeting where there were about sixty of his followers, nearly all armed. He spoke at that meeting, and said that the police wanted to arrest him. "But these," he said, "are the real police," pointing to those present. On the 5th he told Charles Nolin that he had decided to induce the people to take up arms, and he had begun to speak to him of doing so as early as December previous.

On the 17th of March he said to Dr. G. Willoughby, sixty or seventy armed half-breeds being present, that they intended to strike a blow to assert their rights; and, pointing to the men, "You see now I have my police. In one week that little Government police will be wiped out of existence." He added that the time had come when he was to rule this country or perish in the attempt, and that the rebellion of fifteen years ago (in which he had also been the leader) "would not be a patch upon this one."

To Mr. Lash, whom, on the 18th of March, at the head of his armed followers, he arrested, he said that the rebellion had commenced, and they intended to fight until the whole of the Saskatchewan valley was in their hands; that he had been waiting fifteen years, and at last his opportunity had come; and that he would give the police every opportunity to surrender, but if they did not do so there would be bloodshed.

On the same day he, with about fifty armed followers, came to the stores of the witnesses Kerr and Walters, and demanded the arms and ammunition, the removal of which he superintended.

On the 20th he said to Thomas McKay that this was Major Crozier's last opportunity of averting bloodshed, and that, unless he surrendered Fort Carleton, an attack would be made that night.

On the 21st the prisoner sent a demand, written and signed by himself, to the same Major Crozier, then in command of the Mounted Police at Fort Carleton, demanding an unconditional surrender of the fort and of his force, and threatening a war of extermination on refusal. This demand was not presented as written, because his messenger who carried it, on conferring with Major Crozier's representative, saw that it would be peremptorily rejected.

On the 26th the prisoner, with a force of between three and four hundred armed men, proceeded to attack the police and the volunteers, on their way from Fort Carleton to Duck Lake, and he himself gave the command to fire, when nine men were killed.

It has been made a question which side fired first on this occasion, but Riel's own statement to Captain Young was, that they were endeavouring to surround the Government force while Major Crozier was engaged in a parley with one of Riel's people; and that it was part of his plan to capture the police force, or some high Government official, in order to compel negotiations, has been stated by him to the Rev.
well as to Captain Young.

From that time until the suppression of the rebellion by the taking of Batoche, on the 12th of May, he was the unquestioned leader of the movement. Being urged by Mr. Astley, after the second engagement, which took place at Fish Creek, to allow him to negotiate, he said to him, what he also repeated to the witness Ross, that they must have another victory first, when they would be able to make better terms with the Government; and to the end he remained, not merely in the ostensible, but in the actual control of the armed force, negotiating in that capacity with the commander of the troops, and with an authority never doubted by those who, being his prisoners, observed his conduct, or questioned by anyone of those in arms under him.

A CONFIDENTIAL ENQUIRY.

It may be asserted with confidence that there never has been a rebellion more completely dependent upon one man; that had he at any moment so desired, it would have come to an end; and that had he been removed a day before the out break, it would, in all probability, never have occurred. A dispassionate perusal of the whole evidence will leave no room for doubt upon this point, and that this was his own opinion appears by his statement to Father Andre, to be presently referred to. Finally, under this head, as regards the mental state of the prisoner, after his trial and before execution, careful enquiry was made into this question by medical experts employed confidentially by the Government for that purpose, and nothing was elicited showing any change in his mental powers or casting any doubt upon his perfect knowledge of his crime, or justifying the idea that he had not such mental capacity as to know the nature and quality of the act for which he was convicted, as to know that the act was wrong, and as to be able to control his own conduct.

THE POLITICAL PRETENCE.

(3.) It has been urged that the prisoner's crime was a political one, inspired by political motives alone; that a rebellion prompted only for the redress of alleged political grievances differs widely from an ordinary crime, and that, however erroneous may be the judgment of its leader, in endeavoring to redress the supposed wrongs of others, he is entitled, at least, to be regarded as unselfish and as in his own view patriotic.

This ground has been most earnestly considered, but the Government has been unable to recognize in the prisoner a political offender only, or to see that upon the evidence there can be any doubt that his motives were mainly selfish. On the contrary, it seems plain that he was willing at any moment, for the sake of gain, to desert his deluded followers, and to abandon his efforts for the redress of their alleged grievances if, under cover of them, he could have obtained satisfaction for his own personal money demands. It is believed that many who have espoused his cause and desired to avert from him the sentence which the law pronounced must have been ignorant of this fact, or cannot duly have considered its proper effect, for it seems incredible that anyone knowing it could regard the prisoner as entitled to the character of a patriot, or adopt him as the representative of an honorable race. It is to be remembered that the prisoner had left this country and gone to the United States, where he had become an American citizen. He was brought here, therefore, avowedly to represent the claims of others, although in his letter of acceptance to the delegates he mentioned his own grievances as enabling him to make common cause with them. It is clear, however, from the evidence of Dr. Willoughby and Mr. Astley, that from the beginning his own demand, which he himself claimed against the Government, was uppermost in his thoughts, and as early as December he attempted to make a direct bargain with the Government for its satisfaction. Father Andre was a witness called on behalf of the prisoner, and there can be no reason whatever to question the correctness of his statement. His evidence on cross-examination by Mr. Casgrain was as follows:—

Q. I believe in the month of December, 1884, you had an interview with Riel and Nolin with regard to a certain sum of money which the prisoner claimed from the Federal Government?

A. Not with Nolin. Nolin was not present at the interview?

Q. The prisoner was there?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you please state what the prisoner asked of the Federal Government?

A. I had two interviews with the prisoner on that subject.

Q. The prisoner claimed a certain indemnity from the Federal Government, didn't he?

A. When the prisoner made his claim I was there with another gentleman, and he asked from the Government $100,000. We thought that was exorbitant, and the prisoner said, 'Wait a little; I will take at once $35,000 cash.'

Q. And on that condition the prisoner was to leave the country, if the Government gave him the $35,000?

A. Yes, that was the condition he put.

Q. When was this?

A. This was on the 23rd December, 1884.

Q. There was also another interview between you and the prisoner?

A. There has been about twenty interviews between us.

Q. He was always after you to ask you to use your influence with the Federal Government to obtain his indemnity?

A. The first time he spoke of it was on the 12th of December. He had never spoken a word about it before, and on the 23rd of December he spoke about it again.

Q. He talked about it very frequently?

A. On these two occasions only."

Q. That was his great occupation?

A. Yes, at those times.

Q. Is it not true that the prisoner told you he himself was the half-breed question?

A. He did not say so in express terms, but he conveyed that idea. He said: 'If I am satisfied the half-breeds will be.' I must explain this. This objection was made to him, that even if the Government granted him the $35,000 the half-breed question would remain the same, and he said, in answer to that, 'If I am satisfied the half-breeds will be.'

Q. Is it not a fact he told you he would even accept a less sum than the $35,000?

A. Yes, he said: 'Use all the influence you can: you may not get all that, but get all you can, and if you get less we will see.'

THE EVIDENCE OF NOLIN

This evidence confirms that of Charles Nolin, a very prominent half breed, at one time Minister of Agriculture in the Government of Manitoba, who had strongly sympathized with Riel and the movement, until armed rebellion became imminent, when he separated from him, and afterwards gave evidence for the Crown. This was his testimony:—

"In the beginning of December, 1884, he began to show a desire to have money; he spoke to me about it first, I think."

Q. How much did he say he wanted?

A. The first time he spoke of money I think he said he wanted $10,000 or $15,000.

Q. From whom would he get the money?

A. The first time he spoke about it he did not know any particular plan to get it; at the same time he told me that he wanted to claim an indemnity from the Canadian Government. He said that the Canadian Government owed him about $100,000, and then the question arose who the persons were whom he would have to talk to the Government about the indemnity. Some time after that the prisoner told me that he had an interview with Father Andre, and that he had made peace with the Church; that since his arrival in the country he had tried to separate the people from the clergy; that until that time he was at open war almost with the clergy. He said that he went to the church with Father Andre, and in the presence of another priest and the Blessed Sacrament he had made peace and said he would never again do anything against the clergy. Father Andre told him he would use his influence with the Government to obtain for him $35,000. He said that he would be contented with $35,000 then, and that he would settle with the Government himself for the balance of the $100,000. The agreement took place at St. Laurent, and then Father Andre went back to his mission at Prince Albert.

Q. Before December were there meetings at which Riel spoke, and at which you were present?

A. Yes.

Q. How many?

A. Till the 24th February, I assisted at seven meetings, to the best of my knowledge.

Q. Did the prisoner tell you what he would do if the Government paid him the indemnity in question?

A. Yes.

Q. What did he tell you?

A. He said if he got the money he wanted from the Government, he said he would go wherever the Government wished to send him. He had told that to Father Andre. If he was an embarrassment to the Government by remaining in the North-West he would even go to the Province of Quebec. He said also that if he got the money he would go to the United States and start a paper, and raise the other nationalities in the States. He said:—'Before the grass is that high in this country, you will see foreign armies in this country.' He said, 'I will commence by destroying Manitoba, and then I will come and destroy the North-West and take possession of the North-West.'

Much has been made of the argument that the prisoner came here at the request of others, but for which he would have remained away, and that being here he desired to return to the United States, and would have done so were it not for the urgency of those who had induced him to come. As to this Charles Nolin swore as follows:—

Q. Was there a meeting about that time, about the 8th or 24th of February?

A. A meeting?

Q. At which the prisoner spoke?

A. There was a meeting on the 24th of February, when the prisoner was present.

Q. What took place at that meeting; did the prisoner say anything about his departing for the United States?

A. Yes.

Q. What did the prisoner tell you about that?

A. He told me that it would be well to try and make it appear as if they wanted to stop him going to the States. Five or six persons were appointed to go among the people, and when Riel's going away was spoken about, the people were to say 'No, no.' It was expected that Gagnon would be there, but he was not there. Riel never had any intention of leaving the country.

Q. Who instructed the people to do that?

A. Riel suggested that himself.

Q. Was that put in practice?

A. Yes.

The counsel for the other half-breeds who pleaded guilty, also stated in court that Riel had himself procured the request to him to come to this country; and on two occasions in court these learned gentlemen most earnestly and indignantly denounced the prisoner as one who had misled and deceived their clients, and to whom all the misery and ruin which this unhappy rebellion had brought upon them was to be attributed.

HIS TAMPERING WITH THE INDIANS.

But if an unselfish desire could be credited to the prisoner to redress political wrongs even by armed rebellion, it would at least have been necessary to disprove the charge which lies against him, that in his own mind the claims of humanity had no place, but that he was prepared to carry out his designs by bringing upon an unoffending people all the horrors of an Indian rising, with the outrages and atrocities which, as he knew full well, must inevitably accompany it. That this cannot be disproved, but that it is beyond all dispute true, the evidence makes plain. From the beginning, even before Duck Lake, he was found in company with Indians armed, and to the end he availed himself of their assistance. In that engagement, the first occasion of bloodshed, according to the evidence of the witnesses Astley, Ross, and William Tompkins, the Indians composed a large portion of his force—one-third, or thereabouts.

In a letter found in the camp of Pound-Maker, an Indian chief, in the prisoner's handwriting, and signed by him, after describing in the most exaggerated language what is termed their victory at Duck Lake, it is said:—"Praise God for the success He has given us. Capture all the police you possibly can. Preserve their arms. Take Fort Battle, but save the provisions, munitions and arms. Send a