

Now let us hear Father Brouillet's account of the affair in contradiction to Miss Bewley's deposition :

"We did," says the reverend gentleman, "all that charity could claim, and even more than prudence seemed to permit. We kept her for seventeen days in our house, provided for all her wants, and treated her well, and if she had minded us, and heeded our advice and entreaties, she would never have been subjected to that Indian. When she came first to our house, and told us that Five Crows had sent for her to be his wife, we asked her what she wanted to do. Did she want to go with him, or not? She said she did not want to go with him. 'Stay with us, then, if you like; we will do for you what we can,' was our offer. When the evening came, the Indian chief called for her. The writer then requested his interpreter to tell him that she did not want to be his wife, and that, therefore, he did not want her to go with him. The interpreter, who was an Indian, allied by marriage to the Cayuses, and knew the chief's disposition well, would not provoke his anger, and refused to interpret. The writer, then making use of a few Indian words he had picked up during the few days he had been there, and with the aid of signs, spoke to the Indian himself, and succeeded in making him understand what he meant. The Indian rose furiously, and without uttering a word went away. The young woman then got frightened, and wanted to go for fear he might come back and do us all an injury. The writer tried to quiet her, and insisted that she should remain at our house, but to no avail; she must go, and off she went. The Indian, still in his fit of anger, refused to receive her, and sent her back. She remained with us three or four days undisturbed; until one evening, without any violence on the part of the Indian, or without advising with us, she went with him to his lodge. She came back the next morning, went off again in the evening, and continued so, without being forced by the Indian, and part of the time going by herself, until at last she was told to select between the Indian's lodge and our house, as such a loose way of acting could not be suffered any longer. That was the first and only time that she offered any

resistance to the will of the Indian; but, indeed, her resistance was very slight, if we can believe her own statement."

This is a very different account from that sworn to by Miss Bewley, but written by Spaulding, as he says himself, *Ex. Doc. No. 37*, p. 27: "I would go to an individual, and take down in writing what he or she knew, and then go before a magistrate, and the individual would make an oath to the statement, the officer certifying." There is no mention that the parties were permitted to read what their amanuensis took down, and all who are acquainted with such *ex-parte* depositions know how easily it would be to alter their sense and meaning by an unscrupulous person—which we are about to show Spaulding to be. In this very statement there are two interpolations, one of eight lines on page 35 of *Ex. Doc. No. 37*, beginning with the words "I arose," and one of six on the following page, at "The next day," which materially alter the whole meaning of the document. This alteration of a sworn statement by any but the affiant is at common law *forgery*, and ought to entitle the person who makes it to the delicate attention of the prosecuting attorney of his county. Whether the saint and angel, Miss Bewley, is now aware of the forgery connected with her name we know not, but we trust that the Senate will make a note of it for the benefit of future historians. But Spaulding, who is described by his missionary Gray as "quite impulsive and bitter in his denunciations of a real or supposed enemy," in endeavoring to make out a case, is not content with altering one affidavit. That of Mr. Osborne (*Ex. Doc. No. 37*, p. 32) is also materially changed in several places from the original, and the official reports of Mr. McLane (*Ex. Doc. p. 33*) and of Dr. White are