

THE TRUE WITNESS

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
The Post Printing & Publishing Co.
AT THEIR OFFICE:
751 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

Subscription per annum \$1.50
Paid strictly in advance \$1.00

TO ADVERTISERS.
A limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in "THE TRUE WITNESS" at the per line (single line) insertion, 10c per line each subsequent insertion. Special Notices 50c per line. Special rates for contracts on application. Advertisements for Teachers, Information Wanted, etc., 50c per line (not to exceed 10 lines). Ordinary notices of Births, Deaths and Marriages 10c each insertion. The large and increasing circulation of "THE TRUE WITNESS" makes it the best advertising medium in Canada.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.
Subscribers in the country should always give the name of their Post Office. Those who remove should give the name of the old as well as the new Post Office. Remittances can be safely made by Registered Letter or by the Office Order. All remittances will be acknowledged by changing the date on the address label attached to the paper. Subscribers will see by date on the address label when their subscription expires. Sample copies sent free on application. Ladies wishing to become subscribers can do so through any responsible news agent, when there is some of our local agents in their locality. Address all communications to

The Post Printing & Publishing Co.

NO DISCOUNT FROM THE REGULAR SUBSCRIPTION PRICE OF \$1.50 PER ANNUM WILL BE ALLOWED IN ANY CASE EXCEPT WHEN PAYMENT IS MADE ABSOLUTELY IN ADVANCE, OR WITHIN 30 DAYS OF COMMENCEMENT OF SUBSCRIPTION.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1885

TAMMANY HALL is not dead yet. There is considerable vigor and life in the old wigwag, as was witnessed in the elections yesterday. It was only supposed by some that Tammany had been crippled beyond recovery during the Presidential elections, but the victory of its leader, Hugh Grant, who ran for Sheriff of New York, is another instance of how human calculations are liable to err. Grant defeated the county democracy candidate by 10,000 and his Republican opponent by 7,000. This is quite a handsome result and places Tammany on the top of the political ladder once more in New York.

To such Ireland in the powers necessary or desirable for the management of purely Irish matters is "a moral error." So said Mr. Gladstone in his Edinburgh speech last evening. Well, the same Grand Old Man has been nursing and coquetting with that "moral error" for many a long decade. In fact, Mr. Gladstone has had altogether too much complacency for "moral errors," such as his coercion acts and other interesting features of his legislation and administration. If he does not hurry up and establish some visible relations between his professions and his practices, he will carry the "moral error" to his grave.

FISH & GRANDIN, whose jurisdiction extends over the North West Territories, the scene of the late rebellion, has come East on a mission of charity. A very large portion of the population are in a condition of extreme poverty and want. Some of them are absolutely destitute, with starvation already staring him in the face. The position of affairs is so serious that Bishop Grandin considered it his duty to come to Ottawa and personally bring the matter before the Government. His Lordship strongly urged that with his assistance the half-breed women and children will not be able to pull through the winter. It can be safely accepted that unless the situation fully justified his intervention, Bishop Grandin would not have appealed to the Government for aid.

On another page will be found a full and descriptive account of the rise and progress of the Young Men's Society in St. Ann's Parish of this city. The results achieved within the short space of a year by the young men of this society, under the able and zealous direction of the Rev. Father, are something to be proud of. Their society is in a most flourishing condition, and the success which has attended their intelligent and enthusiastic efforts is well and forcibly evidenced in the erection of a large and handsome hall in the centre of the parish. The building will receive the blessing of the church to-morrow, and will at the same time be inaugurated with all due ceremony. Sunday, November 8th, will be a proud day in the annals of the parish, and one which the young men will have much reason to recall with pleasure. Give young men good and virtuous surroundings and we will have good and virtuous citizens.

THERE is one great chorus of jubilation in the American press over the annihilation of the monument which Cyrus W. Field had erected to the memory of Andre, the British spy. The monument had been erected in defiance of the American people, who considered it, as it really was, a slur upon the patriotism of the men who achieved the Independence of the Republic, and an imputation on the honor of the nation. It was too much to ask the American people to stand, and now that it has been shattered they are glad. The N. Y. Sun points out a very simple way to prevent any further efforts to destroy it. Our contemporary suggests the placement of a shining inscription and the engraving upon it of these words:—

THIS STONE
Marks the spot where JOHN ANDRE,
A British spy,
Was first publicly hanged
By the Order of Gen. GEORGE WASHINGTON.
From all people to whose memory
Memory is due respect and consideration.
Nobody will object to the monument

THE CAMPAIGN EXPENSES.

The election expenses in Ireland will not be as heavy in the present campaign as they used to be in old times. This is due to the fact that in many of the constituencies there will be no contest for the seats. The campaign, however, cannot be successfully conducted without an expenditure of between fifty and seventy five thousand dollars for all Ireland. The raising of this large sum has been one of the chief sources of Mr. Parnell's anxiety, and it is now known that he intended if necessary to expend his entire private fortune in the cause, as he did once before; but the generosity of the Irish abroad will make this second sacrifice of the Irish leader unnecessary. The appeal for funds to meet the expenses of the parliamentary campaign is being liberally responded to from every quarter of the globe. Even subscriptions have been sent from France by French bodies. The United States are well to the front, and it behoves Canada to keep up with the tide that will float the Irish party into College Green. It will not do for Irish Canadians to be distanced in the great work of building up Irish independence.

KEEPING THE HANGMAN OFF!

LOUIS RIEL does not hang to-day. The shame and disgrace of the execution have been postponed for six days. At a Cabinet council yesterday a respite for that period was decided upon and telegraphed to Regina. The *Gazette* says that the reason of the action of the Government is not stated, and adds, "there is no room to doubt that the extreme penalty of the law will be carried out on Monday." We hope for the sake of the government, the honor of Canada and the harmony of the people that our esteemed contemporary will prove a false prophet, and that Monday, the 10th of November, no more than Tuesday, the 10th of November, 1885, will witness the inauguration of an era of strife and discord from the scaffold at Regina, nor the infliction of a punishment which the civilized world condemns, when the verdict does not justify, and which would cover Canada with disgrace and its victim with honor and glory. The hangman should have no hand or part in the great work of building up and consolidating this Canadian Confederation. The vindication and maintenance of our constitution do not require the services of the hangman, especially after the issue has been fairly and gallantly fought out on the field of battle. Keep the hangman off the scene!

RIGHT AGAIN.

THE POST is right again, as it always is. The proposal of our evening contemporary to import foreign experts or specialists to boss the situation and direct the efforts made to stamp out the smallpox, met with our instant and emphatic disapprobation. We pointed out that such an importation would be nothing short of an insult to our own professional men, and a libel on their ability and on their scientific attainments, while it would signify to the outside world that Montreal and Canada either could not produce or could not support a competent specialist. It is, therefore, satisfactory to see that the Citizens' Committee, which had the matter before them, ultimately took the same view of it as *The Post*, and rejected the proposal. Dr. Baker Edwards, who considered that such action would place the Committee in a false position and would be certainly looked upon as a humiliation to our universities and scientific men generally, gave forcible expression to his indignation and to his opposition to sending to the United States or elsewhere for foreign advice. He maintained "that there was every bit as good medical men in the city, quite capable of giving the advice needed, as could be picked up abroad. They had eminent medical men here and first class universities, and to call a foreigner in here to sit on the universities and the competency of the medical profession in Montreal would be humiliating to Montreal and to Canada. He hoped they would not make fools of themselves at this committee by going outside when there were first-class practitioners at home."

AN EXCESS OF FEMALES.

The male population of the State of Massachusetts is running away behind, while the female is on the increase. The girls seem to thrive a great deal better on pork and beans than the boys. The returns of the Massachusetts census, recently issued for the year 1885, disclose the fact that the women and girls outnumber the men and boys by 70,027. There is no other State of the Union where the female surplusage reaches this extraordinary figure. The successive censuses of the State and United States, taken at every decade and half-decade, show that during the past fifty years the growth of the excess of females over males has been not only steady but rapid. Here are the figures of the steady march of female encroachment, beginning with 1810, and recording its appalling progress at periods every five years since 1855:—

The excess of women and girls in Massachusetts was only 7,672 forty-five years ago,

State increased about two hundred and fifty per cent., but the girls have increased their majority one thousand per cent. It is about time for some of them to move West.

THE TESTIMONY OF NINETY FOUR PATIENTS.

The *Daily Witness* has itself ceased to manufacture coarse and lying charges of inhumanity against the good and noble Sisters of Charity, but it allows anonymous bigots to add to the pile of indecencies with which its own paid writers and reporters have filled its columns during the past week. In its last evening's issue it prints a half column of vituperation and abuse, more vile and loathsome than smallpox itself, from a scribbler who is ashamed of his name, and who spices his tirade with ridicule of the saints and the dead.

The "only religious daily" ought to be ashamed of itself in allowing its hatred of the nuns and its bigotry to carry it to such extremes. We have before us a brief document which gives the *Witness* the lie direct, and which is signed by ninety four persons who have been patients in the St. Roch's hospital. They are of all classes and of different creeds and nationalities. The following is the statement of these 94 people:—

"We, the undersigned, patients in St. Roch's Hospital, certify herewith, that the accusations and malicious assertions of the *Witness* and *Herald* of Montreal, concerning the administration of the above mentioned institution, since the Grey Nuns have taken charge of it, are absolutely false and without the slightest foundation. We make use of this occasion to thank the good nuns for their great devotion to us at all times, and to the good Dr. Nolan, who displayed great zeal and intelligence, as physician of the hospital, in giving us all the help that lay in his power and whom we shall never forget."

CARDINAL NEWMAN ON DISESTABLISHMENT.

There is a story going the rounds of the press that Cardinal Newman is in favor of the Establishment church of England and that he would oppose its disestablishment, on the grounds that it is the great bulwark against infidelity in Great Britain. This announcement would appear to be a repetition of an old report put in circulation twenty years ago. Cardinal Newman is credited with a great deal more than he said or intended to convey. In a new and interesting book, "Catholic Life and Letters of Cardinal Newman," by Mr. Oldcastle, we find this very question discussed and settled by the eminent Catholic divine himself. In a letter dated Nov. 9, 1865, addressed to the editor of the *Weekly Register*, the then Rev. Dr. Newman says: "I beg leave to call your attention to a passage in your admirable review last week of Dr. Pusey's work. It is there asserted by implication that the 'statement that the Church of England is, in God's hands, the great bulwark against infidelity in this land,' was 'originally enunciated by Dr. Newman.' I have written in my lifetime a great deal more than I can remember, but I neither know where I have made this particular statement nor can I conceive I ever made it, whether in print, in private letter or in conversation. And I am sure I should not have made it deliberately. Certainly it does not express my real judgment concerning the Church of England. Nor have I any reason to think that Dr. Pusey ascribes it to me. What I said in my 'Apologia' was this:—'Doubtless the National Church has hitherto been a serviceable breakwater against doctrinal errors more fundamental than its own.' The words 'serviceable' and 'breakwater' both convey the idea of something accidental and *de facto*; whereas a bulwark is an essential part of the thing defended. Moreover, in saying 'against doctrinal errors more fundamental than its own' I simply meant that while it serves Catholic Truth in one respect, nevertheless in another it has doctrinal errors, and those fundamental."

From this it is clear that Cardinal Newman did not, as he could not, endorse the Church of England as the exponent of Catholic doctrine or the defender of the Christian religion.

PATRONIZE OUR OWN.

The suggestion of the *Journal Daily Star*, put in the form of a motion by Mr. Michaels, who is an expert on Parliamentary procedure, at the meeting of the Citizens' Committee on Monday evening, "to bring to Montreal an expert from the United States to make a 'careful investigation into the smallpox epidemic, and to advise the Health and 'Citizens' committees, etc., etc.," is looked upon as an insult to the gentlemen comprising those committees, and a libel on their intelligence. The various committees and boards have done good work since their formation, and we are satisfied that there is as much practical ability in their composition as any the *Star* can import. Granted there are no specialists among the number, is there any need of going outside our own city, or to make the limits wider, outside our own country for scientific or other aid that may be required in the unfortunate crisis through which we are now passing? We say no! Not content with actually ruining the trade and reputation of our fair city, the *Star* would now have the world believe that in this, the metropolis of Canada, and even in Canada itself, we are without a professional man—a specialist—who could be relied upon as capable of devising the best means to be employed in stamping out smallpox. We protest against the imputation thus cast upon our professional men. There is no need of running to New York, Boston or Philadelphia for scientific opinions or aid. In physical science, sanitary science, engineering, etc., we have among us men who have made for themselves a high reputation, and are to-day reckoned as good as can be found in any city in Europe or on this continent. Why not call on them and pay them as foreigners would have to be paid? It is a

to be urging to seek abroad for what we have at home. Only a few days ago the same paper urged the sending of a deputation to the United States to procure a suitable person to manage the disinfecter recently purchased in England. Any ordinary Canadian could manage this apparatus after a few hours of instruction. The next thing we expect to hear of is a suggestion and a motion to send across the border for drivers for the smallpox vans. We could understand, and perhaps excuse, a proposal to engage foreigners to substitute themselves for Canadian victims of the smallpox. That would be a more profitable use to put them to.

THE LESSONS OF THE NEW YORK ELECTIONS.

Contrary to the prognostications of a large portion of the press of the neighboring republic the Democrats have been overwhelmingly victorious in the State of New York in the local election. In that State the chief interest centred, as it has come now to be regarded as the keystone in electoral contests. Two elements have been prominent in the contest. Civil Service reform and Protection, but of the two the latter has been the most potent. The nomination of Hill by the Democrats in effect conveyed a rebuke to Cleveland, as indicating that his principle, or, perhaps, more correctly speaking, practice, of reform in the Civil Service system and his departure from the old doctrine that to the victors belong the spoils to such an extent that no way is to be granted to the vanquished, were neither of them acceptable to the party. It is true that a fair measure of toleration in Civil Service matters was indicated in the platform of the Democratic convention, but the action of the party subsequently has been of a character showing that the promise was made and interpreted in a Protectionist sense only or as a "catch vote" cry.

The victory of Hill, in this respect, is an intimation to Federal and State Executives that Democratic administrations should be run and engineered in all their branches from top to bottom, by men who profess and support Democratic principles.

The question of "Protection" was also one which influenced the elections very largely. The Republican platform contained, it is true, a plank strongly endorsing the protective system; but the Republican candidate, Ira Davenport, and his principal supporters in the canvass, never mentioned the word once in their political addresses to the electors. They ignored the question and sought to keep it from being made an issue in the election. This was done to please the Mugwumps, who are for the most part an un-American set, and go in for English ideas. The Mugwumps, yielding to English influence are in favor of free trade, and they prevailed upon the managers of the republican campaign to throw protection overboard. They had voted against Blaine in the Presidential contest on account of his strong American sentiment; in the present contest they voted for Davenport on account of his weakness in that respect. The influence of the Mugwumps has now been thoroughly annihilated by the vote of yesterday. Their insignificance and their impotency have been made manifest beyond the shadow of a doubt. The Irish vote that was cast so largely for Blaine in the general elections went solid this time in favor of Hill, the Democratic candidate, and literally swamped the English and anti-Irish Mugwumps. This is simply demonstrated by the vote in Brooklyn and New York, which have given a gain of more than 14,000 over the vote of Cleveland for President. The result of the election indicates three things: first, that the people look upon civil service reform pretty much as a fraud and a farce; secondly, that the Mugwumps had better locate in a cemetery and dig their graves; and finally, that free trade has no show against protection.

THE SINNER SINNED AGAINST.

Our two esteemed evening contemporaries, the *Montreal Daily Witness* and the *Daily Star*, are at loggerheads over the St. Roch's hospital business. The *Witness*, which does not hesitate to calumniate and bring false charges against its neighbor, does strongly object to be made the victim of falsehood and calumny. Certainly a man should not be sinned against because he sins against another, on the ground that two blacks do not make a white; but once the sinner is sinned against it becomes food for amusement to see and hear him protest against the injury done him. As you would have others do unto you, do ye also unto them. This Christian maxim demands reciprocity of good amongst neighbors. It won't do for any man to do harm to others and then expect that nothing but good should fall to him. Thus for eight or ten days the *Daily Witness* was flinging mud at the Sisters of Charity; it worked up the bigotry, prejudices and animosity of its benighted readers against these noblest and most self-sacrificing of God's creatures; it endeavored with all its ingenuity and cunning to get the public to brand these holy women as heartless and cruel slayers of suffering patients; it tried hard to persuade the world that the St. Roch's Hospital was nothing but a "den of horrors." The *Daily Witness* could not be made to understand or feel that its utterances were calculated to work a grievous injury and wrong to the good and true women, and to make sad havoc of both truth and justice. But as soon as the shoe of falsehood and calumny pinched its own corn, it cries out, Hold! Stop! You are doing me wrong! Well, we hope, for its own sake, and for the sake of honest and decent journalism, that the *Star* has done it wrong. The *Star* published a communication for

which the writer undertakes to give the public one or two facts that, according to him, may possibly explain the tortuous conduct of the *Witness* in publishing the alleged horrors of St. Roch's. The following are the facts which the *Star* correspondent refers to and makes public:—

"Several days ago the publisher of the paper in question (the *Daily Witness*) gave explicit instructions to his reporter to report all smallpox matters in a way that would be unpalatable to the Board of Health; the reporters were ordered at the same time to keep out everything favorable to the Board. Would you believe it, sir, the reason given for this line of conduct was an openly expressed desire to injure certain members of the Board, irrespective of the consequences to the city, and in discussions that took place in the office there was no apparent anxiety about the city's health so long as injury could be inflicted on the individuals in question."

The *Daily Witness* naturally felt the sting of these charges, and lost no time in denying them, denouncing the paper that published them and the person who wrote them.

If *The Post* and the community at large were like the *Witness* and imitated its example, we would refuse to accept its denial of the charges and would feel little impressed with its denunciations of the slanderers, just as the *Witness* stubbornly refused to accept the denials, by the Sisters of Charity and by hundreds of patients, of its infamous charges against the management of St. Roch's. But we are not desirous of imitating the rabid, ungenerous, and unjust conduct of our esteemed contemporary. We can afford to be magnanimous towards an opponent who has been slamed against, although he has himself grievously sinned in the same direction. Although the *Daily Witness* declined to believe the Rev. Mr. Evans, hundreds of patients, and the good Sisters of Charity themselves, that the charges it was publishing were false and unjust, we do not hesitate one moment to believe the *Daily Witness* when it says that the charges leveled at its honor and integrity as a public journal are false. The *Star* correspondent may have been laboring under a delusion or may have been misled by incorrect information as to the basis working of the *Witness* office. As to the action of the *Star* in publishing the communication, we leave that to both our esteemed contemporaries to settle amongst themselves.

LET THE GOVERNMENT ABIDE BY THE VERDICT.

There is no doubt that the view taken by *The Post* of the case of Louis Riel, and set forth in our columns yesterday, is the one most in harmony with the nature of the verdict, with the exigencies of the situation in Canada, and with the general feeling of the civilized world.

We have every confidence that the line of argument, which we followed in that article, will commend itself to the attention of the Government, and that they will see the wisdom and the necessity of adopting it in the settlement of Riel's fate.

The Ministry must be governed by the terms and the meaning of the verdict, which keeps the half-breed leader a prisoner in their hands.

They must not yield to the demands of Orangemen, who would have his blood whether or no.

They must not be guided by the appeals of those who would make a hero of Riel on or off the scaffold.

Let the Ministry steer an even keel between the two.

The bloodthirsty, as well as the apologists, should be kept at a respectful distance from the Council Chamber. Nothing but the dictates of justice and the weight of common sense should lead the Cabinet to a decision.

Justice is opposed to the death penalty, for the verdict of the jury which recommends Riel to mercy, is opposed to it.

Common sense tells us to avoid all acts that would be fruitful in evil or danger, and the Government have not it within their power to work greater injury to the Dominion of Canada than by making a political martyr of Louis Riel. Thus, therefore, the Government, according to the strict interpretation of the verdict, have neither the obligation nor the right to hang him.

We hope that John Macdonald and his colleagues will not assume an obligation which is not imposed on them, or a right which is not given them. They have only to carry out the will of the jury that tried Riel. They have not to go beyond it; they cannot go beyond it. Now the jury have distinctly and emphatically *willed* that Riel should not be hanged, or otherwise their recommendation to mercy would mean nothing. But such an interpretation of the verdict cannot be admitted.

The integrity of the verdict cannot be interfered with. The reasoning and intelligent public of the country understand this and they will expect the Cabinet to govern itself accordingly. We find that our morning contemporary, the *Montreal Herald*, has already fallen into line with our view of the case. It says:—

"And here let us say that, if the Government were to execute Riel, it could not be said to be carrying out the verdict of the jury that tried him with a full knowledge of all the facts for and against him. The jury recommended the man to mercy. They did not, therefore, recommend the death penalty. This was imposed by the Judge, who took no notice of the recommendations. It will be claimed that, if the verdict of 'guilty' is the portion of the verdict, the other portion of the verdict should also have been considered. The verdict was not simply 'guilty,' but 'guilty, with a recommendation to mercy.' If the death penalty be imposed, there are many who will recall the fact that the jury who found him guilty of high treason thought they saw much in the action of the man, and the surrounding circumstances, and the evidence adduced, to warrant them in making a recommendation which they supposed would save him from death by the hangman. In full view of the scaffold, the recollection of the actual words of the verdict stand forth

TWO RECORDS CONTRASTED.

THE "EVENING POST" knows perfectly well that the statements published in the *Witness* concerning St. Roch's were genuine and honest. If it has any intelligent readers, they certainly know this also; so we presume it is satisfied with the approval of the ignorant. Its vituperations are beneath notice. (*Daily Witness*, Nov. 6th.)

We never questioned the genuineness of the *Witness* statements concerning St. Roch's, in so far as they were made to its reporters and published in its columns; but we did question the genuineness and truth of what was contained in the said statements. What they purported to convey to the public regarding the management of the hospital and the treatment of the patients was both exaggerated and false. The fact of a person saying or writing anything does not impart to his statement a character of genuineness or truth.

Statements are only true and genuine when their substance is in accordance with facts. Now the substance of the *Witness* statements was not in such accord, as has been amply evidenced. Consequently, our contemporary has published dishonest and false statements concerning the hospital. There is no getting over that conclusion.

The *Witness* says: "If *The Post* has any intelligent readers." Well, if we haven't, who has? The views of *The Post* on all public questions have commanded the approval and support of the most intelligent people in the city and the country.

Concerning this St. Roch's business, the authorities and public opinion were governed by what *The Post* had to say on the matter. *The Post* also settled the proposal to close the churches and Sunday schools. We alone fought that battle and prevented infidelity and atheism scoring a point under the cover of good intentions and scientific endeavor. *The Post*, from the very beginning, denounced the newspaper sensationalism that was hatched out of the epidemic, and we saw the merchants, the Board of Trade, the medical colleges, the clergy, in fact every interest, call meetings and protest against the action of our contemporaries in booming smallpox. To-day we find the most sensational using discretion and coolness in their reports, and among the first to stop the others from giving away to sensation.

Again, *The Post* sat down on the importation of experts and specialists, and the health committees sat down with us.

No later than yesterday the *New York Herald*, in a four column review of the situation, dubbed us the "clever *Post*" of Montreal, and quoted in its despatches an entire article from our columns as the expression of the enlightened and intelligent public opinion on the topics of the day. Talk about intelligent readers! Why we have more of them to the square inch than the *Witness* has to the square yard. The very fact of the existence of such a paper as the "only religious daily" is a proof that there is a sad lack of intelligence and far-mindedness somewhere.

We know of no paper that can pervert not only ancient but modern and contemporary history with such ease as the *Daily Witness* and still live; we know of no paper in a civilized and Christian community that could and can exhibit such hatred of all things Catholic, that can ignore and trample on truth, that can appeal to the worst prejudices, national and religious, as the same *Daily Witness*, and still be read.

Now, would any one pretend to say that such a paper could live and be read, if its readers were to any degree intelligent and fair-minded? Certainly not. They would give it up in disgust and seek for truth and fair play elsewhere.

The *Witness* says that "our vituperations of it are beneath notice." Our contemporary may term our criticisms of its reprehensible conduct as "vituperations." That will not change their force nor diminish their effect and influence. That they may be beneath its notice, we will not dispute; but they are certainly more noticed and approved by the community at large than its base and false accusations against the Sisters of Charity.

THE GOVERNMENT AND RIEL'S FATE.

Will Riel be executed? is the question which the Canadian people still put, even in face of the gallows erected at Regina. The fate of the half-breed leader is in the hands of the Dominion Government. They have given no visible sign of what their intentions are towards the prisoner. The jury that found Riel guilty of the charges laid at his door accompanied their verdict with a strong recommendation to mercy. Will this appeal to the executive for the exercise of clemency in behalf of the defeated rebel go unheeded? Will it fail to meet with any consideration from the Cabinet and to exercise its legitimate influence over its councils and in the determination of its line of action? We cannot see why this extenuation of the verdict should be ignored and should not be made a chief factor in the settlement of Riel's fate. If the verdict of the jury is the power that gives the authorities the right to set the machinery of justice in motion against the liberty or the life of a prisoner, then the authorities should only use and avail themselves of that right to punish with death or imprisonment, according to the meaning of the verdict and within its limitations. The law is not revengful, nor should its application be zealous. The execution of the law should be pushed only to that extent which the verdict warrants and justifies. Now, the Riel verdict does not exact nor would it justify the extreme penalty. The recommendation to mercy embodied by the jury in their verdict against Riel forms an essential part of it, for penal purposes, as the word *guilty*. To ignore the jury's recommendation of a prisoner to mercy