

sworn to as having been used by the prisoner during this one, according to the testimony of the witnesses Faulkner and Turner. When they found, as they had found by the evidence, that the prisoner had left his shop and devoted himself exclusively to the work of opposing Mr. McGee's return, they would see that a more than ordinary feeling of hostility was manifested by the prisoner towards him. The prisoner tells the witness Faulkner that McGee "is a traitor and deserves to be shot." He is found with a pistol going to a picnic; the pistol to be used in a row if one should take place; or if not, it is to be used for practice on a lonely island, where the prisoner could try his proficiency in its use unobserved. Then, they had Mr. Inglis, the witness who told them of threats used by the prisoner, and referred to the prisoner's having been up at McGee's house on a particular occasion. The same witness had told them that the prisoner said McGee was elected, but that he would not take his seat, or if he did that he would not reign long. How was this? Why would not McGee take his seat, or why would he not reign long? The witness had given the answer, when he asked: "Who would do anything to him?" The prisoner at the bar had said, "If nobody else would do it, I would." They found that the prisoner had made a visit to Mr. McGee's house, and it was only fair to assume that this visit was for no friendly purpose. The learned Counsel for the defence had raised no question as to the correctness of the evidence of Inglis and Faulkner, that evidence had not been impeached. These witnesses had spoken of the threats many times reiterated against the life of the Hon. T. D. McGee. As to Turner's evidence the learned Counsel said it should not be believed—but why? Merely because Turner had made a fuller statement before the Court than he had before the Police Magistrate? Because he had said more in his second examination than had appeared in his first? He (Mr. O'Reilly) would first see what Turner's evidence was, and would then discuss its value. It had been shown when Turner and Whelan became acquainted—their intimacy had been established by a photograph, in which they had both appeared together. Now, the prisoner had used expressions before Turner, such as that he would himself go up and shoot McGee, if nobody else would do it. Then, again, he had admitted that he had been up to McGee's house with Enright. Why should he go to McGee's house? Why should the prisoner at the bar feel indignant with McGee, for having denounced Fenianism? Was he (the prisoner) the special guardian or protector of Fenianism; that he should undertake to destroy McGee's life for having denounced it? Surely it was a duty for the Hon. Mr. McGee, as a representative of the people, to have denounced that vile conspiracy; and yet they find that the very day the prisoner had read that speech he denounced Mr. McGee, had a quarrel with his wife, and remained out all night. They heard of the prisoner declaring that he would "blow McGee's bloody brains out before the session was over." The Crown relied upon these declarations, to show the intention of the prisoner. Again it had been testified that when McGee passed in his carriage, the phrase had been used by the prisoner, "It was well we did not get the bloody old pig that night." What night? The night, no doubt, that the prisoner had gone up to Mr. McGee's house with another. The Crown relied upon these expressions, not because they had been used in a few solitary instances, but because they had been made use of time and again over a considerable period of time; because several witnesses had sworn to them; and because of these reiterated accumulations of testimony sworn to by witnesses from Montreal, and because subsequent facts had justified the estimate placed upon these expressions. For these reasons the Crown had relied upon this testimony to prove the intention of the prisoner at the bar. He (Mr. O'Reilly) had been accused of having failed to fulfil the promise which he made in his opening address that he would prove that the death of McGee had been planned by a conspiracy in Montreal. But if the evidence of the witness Wade was to be relied on, what other conclusion could they come to? That evidence was of the most damning character against the prisoner. Wade had given a full description of the parties who met together in Montreal and planned the murder of Mr. McGee, and it appeared, from the evidence of this witness, that the prisoner at the bar was the man who had been appointed