

(No. 54.)

“ GOVERNMENT EMIGRATION BOARD,
 “ 8, PARK STREET, WESTMINSTER,
 “ 6th March, 1873.

“ DEAR MR. HERBERT,—Will you look at a despatch which I wrote from Ottawa, dated 28th April, 1870. I had not got it to refer to last night. You will there see that an amnesty to Riel was one of the conditions proposed by the delegates from the Red River, and rejected by the Government. I have no recollection of more than one interview between Lord Lisgar and Père Ritchot. Judge Black and the delegate Scott were also present. I believe the conversation with Père Ritchot was carried on almost entirely by myself, and had certainly no reference to Riel, but only to the extent of land to be given to the half-breeds.

“ I had afterwards an interview with Ritchot at the Roman Catholic Bishop's house, where he was staying, but neither did he then allude to Riel, his sole object in asking me to call on him being apparently to do away with any supposition that he was disloyal to the British Government.

“ Ever yours truly,
 “ (Signed,) J. W. C. MURDOCH.”

I also produce extracts from two letters from Sir George E. Cartier to myself, dated respectively 8th and 22nd February, 1873.

(No. 125.)

Extract of letter from Sir George Cartier to Sir John Macdonald, dated 47, Welbeck Street, Cavendish Square, 8th February, 1873.

“ MY DEAR MACDONALD,—The only thing I can do to-day is to acknowledge the receipt of your last, of the 22nd January, about “ Riel ” matter.

“ I hear Lord Lisgar is to be here in a few days, and I will hasten to see him about what passed at the interview with Father Ritchot. To the best of my recollection nothing went beyond stating that he would transmit Ritchot's petition to the Queen, praying for an amnesty. Bear in mind that both of us stated to Father Ritchot that the amnesty was a question for the Queen, not for our Government.”

Extract of letter from the same to the same, dated from same place, 23rd February, 1873.

“ MY DEAR MACDONALD,—I have much pleasure in enclosing you a note from Lord Lisgar of yesterday, in which he states exactly what passed between him and Father Ritchot in my presence on the 19th May. He made no promise of any amnesty. He merely stated he would not fail to forward to Her Majesty the petition for an amnesty to which Father Ritchot alluded.

“ Bear in mind that with Father Ritchot and the Archbishop I always took the same ground we both did—namely that the question of amnesty was not for our decision, but for the Queen and Imperial Government. In the interview of the 19th Lord Lisgar also gave assurance to Father Ritchot that the military expedition was going to Red River not to arrest any one, but to maintain order, as done by any garrison of regulars in any Canadian city where there was one. Lord Lisgar forgot to mention this in his note. As he promised it, Lord Lisgar forwarded to the Queen the petition for amnesty sent him by Father Ritchot. You are enabled now to give any answer to any question about the interview of the 19th May.

“ I certify the correctness of the above extracts.
 “ (Signed,) JOHN A. MACDONALD.”

I do not know whether the petitions presented by the delegates was prepared under the direction of Sir George. I have seen a copy of the letter sent by Father Ritchot to

Sir George on the subject of an amnesty, and the official reply. I do not know when I became cognizant of these letters. I do not remember from whom I received copies of them. I never saw the letter to Sir George until I received the copies I have referred to.

Looking at the letter I observe that Father Ritchot refers to a promise of amnesty made by me and Sir George. He deceives himself so far as a promise by me is concerned I made no such promise. In the conversations between Sir George and Father Ritchot, they were moving on different planes; Sir George referring to the amnesty, exclusive of the persons charged with the death of Scott, and Father Ritchot always including them.

I observe Sir George's response, in which he does not dispute the accuracy of Father Ritchot's statement. I have had no communication with Sir George respecting this, and I have no means of explaining its terms. I do not know that Sir George did communicate to me that the Governor General had expressed himself in a liberal way respecting those for whom Father Ritchot was interesting himself, that is the persons implicated in Scott's death.

Neither Sir George nor Lord Lisgar indicated to me that the latter had spoken in the sense mentioned in Sir George's letter to Father Ritchot, of 23rd May. I knew nothing at the time of the final terms of the arrangement owing to my illness.

Question.—Did the Canadian Government or you, as a member thereof, hold out to the delegates that the Government would use their good offices in endeavouring to secure an amnesty?

Answer.—Neither the Canadian Government nor I gave any such assurance to the delegates.

There was no unofficial expression of a desire that the amnesty should be granted by the Imperial Government. On the contrary, the opinion had been expressed to the delegates that the state of public feeling was such as to render the granting of the amnesty impossible. It was stated to them that it was out of the question to grant it at that moment. I do not say that reference may not have been made to the healing influence of time.

It was urged that this was a political offence, and the cases of Wm. Lyon Mackenzie, Papineau and others were referred to as furnishing possible analogies.

I have no recollection of Judge Black pressing for the pardon of those charged with the death of Scott. He did not join the other petitioners in this. My impression is that he either was opposed to it himself, or that he thought it would be hopeless to ask for it then. He was still here when I was taken ill.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
May 1st, 1874.

Examination of Sir John A. Macdonald continued:

I did not resume my duties until the end of September or the beginning of October. I read certain letters written by Archbishop Taché to Mr. Howe, Secretary of State, and his answers. I have no distinct recollection of communications after my return. Although the subject was brought up occasionally, in what manner I cannot now specify without reference to the papers in the Council office, or that of the Secretary of State for the Provinces.

No action, however, was taken by the Government that year (1870), so far as I remember. I cannot say whether there were any communications from the Lieutenant Governor himself on the subject. I cannot remember the next person I saw from the territory on the subject. I saw the Archbishop about the end of 1871. I have no recollection of seeing any one from the territory on this subject except him, from October 1870, until the fall of 1871. I saw the Archbishop here. Sir George saw him in Montreal and here. I think I did not see him with Sir George here. I think I saw him alone. He always pressed for an amnesty in its widest sense and terms.

He did not allege that he had received a pledge that there should be an amnesty,

but he always repeated that he thought himself justified in promising the amnesty. He drew no distinction that I recollect, between the authority he assumed to have on behalf of the Governor General or the Queen, and the authority he assumed in the name of the Government of Canada. He considered that his instructions or commission warranted him in promising the widest amnesty. This was disputed by the Government. He pressed that fall for the amnesty. He founded this pressure partly on the condition of the country and partly on the condition in which he was himself placed in consequence of having made these promises. He said he might be taken to have deceived the people, and that in the interests of peace the fulfilment of his promise was necessary. He said the Metis sympathized with Riel, and nothing less than a full amnesty would be satisfactory. The uniform answer to this was that these representations must be made to the Queen.

Reference was also made to the effect it might have on the English-speaking portion of the population. I do not think that the Archbishop fully appreciated what this effect might be. I do not remember Parisien's name being mentioned. I heard that other deaths had been occasioned in the territory. It was rumoured that some wrong had been done to Parisien, but I do not remember the particulars.

Among other subjects that we discussed was the Fenian raid that had been put down in October, 1871. I spoke to him of information that had been received by the Government, that Riel and Lepine, although professing to act against the Fenian movement, were really in concert with the leaders of that movement.

This he denied, expressing strongly his opinion of their perfect loyalty and that of the Metis generally. He would listen to no suggestion that he might be mistaken on that point.

The Government, however, had information, from various sources, that Riel and Lepine were playing a double game. The Lieutenant-Governor had similar information more or less reliable. At this time we were informed that these men made their headquarters at St. Joe, a village on the border in the United States, chiefly inhabited by Metis; that they both, and especially Riel, crossed the border either secretly at night or attended by an escort.

The Lieutenant-Governor, received information, as did the Government here, that it was the plot of the Fenians to organize another raid after the close of navigation, and after it would be impossible to send military support from here.

We were informed that it was part of the plan to invite the Indians of the plains to join in the movement. Under these circumstances it was thought expedient to induce, if possible, Riel and Lepine to withdraw from the frontier, and go down south into the United States.

The assistance of Archbishop Taché was asked to induce them to withdraw. It was believed that in their absence full confidence might be placed in the Metis, and that they would not join in aiding such an invasion as I have spoken of.

The Bishop would not hear of any imputation on the loyalty of Riel or Lepine, but agreed that it would be for the quiet of that country if they, especially Riel, went away for some considerable time. He agreed with me that there would be a better chance of obtaining the intended amnesty sought from Her Majesty's Government if quiet was kept for a year or so. In his conversation with me I spoke of Riel principally, as I considered that if his absence from the frontier was secured there would be certain quiet.

I undertook to see that His Lordship's expenses in this mission would be paid, and I sent him a draft for a thousand dollars to be used in procuring Riel's withdrawal.

The Bishop left here for Montreal, and there saw, or communicated with, Sir George Cartier, whose opinion was that for the sake of quiet, Lepine's absence was as important as that of Riel, and it was arranged between them that the Bishop would endeavor to secure the withdrawal of both from the frontier. The primary object of the Government was to procure their absence during the whole winter; but His Lordship did not think there was any reason to doubt the loyalty of Riel, and so his exertions were promised on

the ground that it would be for the quiet of the country, and for the interest of Riel himself, to withdraw from the frontier for a considerable time, for a year or so. I considered it unfortunate that Sir George Cartier suggested the junction of Lepine with Riel: I have no particular recollection of talking with the Bishop about the elections in connection with Riel's leaving the country. We may have done so. We talked over the past, present and future prospects of the country. At that time the situation of the country was very different to what it is now. The feeling of bitter hostility between the races was then at its height, having been greatly aggravated by the Fenian invasion. The Government were in constant apprehension of a hostile collision between the races and of the bloodshed that would inevitably ensue. We may have spoken of the elections of the next year as affording an opportunity for such collisions, and, if so, to be avoided. I have, however, no recollection of conversations to that effect with the Bishop, and am inclined to believe that any such conversation must have taken place with Sir George Cartier. I am certain that it was not in the contemplation of any one at that time, that Riel would offer himself as a candidate. Such a step was not mentioned or thought of. He was then a fugitive, coming into the country to his mother's house at night or with a guard.

Having heard Bishop Taché's statement read, I can corroborate a part of it.

There was nothing said about Riel's candidature. The Bishop would not undertake to try to remove Riel by reason of anything connected with the Fenian raid, as he was satisfied of Riel's loyalty, and would not listen to anything to the contrary. His exertions were promised altogether for the quiet of the country, and for the better chance of obtaining a pardon or amnesty from Her Majesty's Government.

I cannot recall to my recollection any conversation with me as to the elections.

I do not at all mean to contradict the Bishop, however, as my opinion must have been then, as it is now, that the continued presence of Riel on the frontier would have an unwholesome effect on the public mind in Manitoba and elsewhere, and would be used as a disturbing cause at the elections, as well in Ontario as elsewhere.

The excitement in Ontario and Quebec was great as well as in Manitoba.

I would repeat, however, that the primary object of the Government was the preservation of quiet in Manitoba during that winter and until the opening of navigation. This was especially the object of Sir George Cartier in joining Lepine and Riel. This involved the division of the sum given to Bishop Taché, and it was too small an amount, in my opinion, to be a sufficient inducement for them both to remain away for any considerable length of time. The Bishop declined to treat with Riel on the ground of his complicity with the Fenian affair, uniformly asserting the loyalty of Riel. It was obviously the policy of the Government here as of the Lieutenant-Governor, notwithstanding any information they might have received or any apprehensions they might entertain, not to evince any mistrust of the Metis.

This ground therefore was put upon one side and we negotiated on the other grounds. I think I pointed out to the Bishop that there would be a better chance of an amnesty if quiet were kept for a year or two. Reference was made as to what the chances were of obtaining an amnesty. I cannot say whether it was said that Riel ought to stay away until after the elections; at any rate, I thought that one thousand dollars would induce him to stay away for a year. I was afraid if he got the whole of the money he might improvidently spend it and then return. This was frustrated to some extent by the arrangement of Sir George Cartier for the division of the money between Riel and Lepine. We carefully avoided giving any opinion that there was a chance of an amnesty. I have little doubt that I stated that it was Riel's best, if not his only chance, that as long as the excitement was kept up on the frontier the Imperial Government would not interfere.

The following passage being read from the testimony of Archbishop Taché:—"If you can succeed in keeping him out of the way for a while I will make his case mine, and I will carry the point." Sir John says, "I certainly said nothing to that effect." I may have said that I would exert my personal influence to procure action in the matter by the Imperial Government, and so far make the case my own.

Nothing was said in these conversations about the subsistence of his family. I do not remember the time when I heard that Sir George had stipulated that the money should be divided between the two, but I presume immediately after Sir George's return, which was very shortly afterwards.

I did not hear the result of the Bishop's mission that I remember.

Lieutenant-Governor Archibald did not communicate with the Government, I am pretty sure. He was in constant communication, unofficially, with Sir George and myself, but I do not remember that in any of them he referred to this subject. These \$1,000 were public funds. They were a portion of a fund placed at my disposal for prevention and detection purposes, commonly called the "Secret Service Fund."

At the time of the negotiations with the Archbishop the raid was over for the time, but we apprehended a renewal as was threatened. I think the first intimation I had of Riel's acting with the loyal population was a telegram in the public journals that Governor Archibald had shaken hands with Riel in front of the palace of the Archbishop. I think this was before the Bishop arrived.

I have no doubt that we had conversation with the Bishop as to the part Riel and Lepine had played. We heard from the Governor that he had gone over the river in the direction of the Bishop's residence to inspect a body of French-speaking volunteers, and that it was proposed that these volunteers should be brought over to his (the Governor's) residence; that he was apprehensive that if this occurred there might be a collision between the French and English-speaking volunteers, and he had therefore thought it judicious to cross the river and go over to them instead. He said nothing as to who were the leaders of the French volunteers. He gave neither me nor the Government intimation of his having negotiated with Riel and Lepine. Upon seeing the report of his having shaken hands with Riel, I wrote for an explanation of the circumstances, which he gave, and that was:—That after an inspection the men were all marched past him singly, and he shook hands with all; that he did not know Riel or Lepine; and that he did not want to know whether they were there or not. I cannot remember whether Governor Archibald sent to the Government copies of the letter of Father Ritchot, or his reply, of October 5th, 1871.

To my knowledge the letter of 8th October, 1871, to Riel and others, was not communicated to the Government, or the letter of Riel and others which was answered by it. He did not, to my recollection, make any communication to the Government in fulfilment of the promise contained in the letter of 8th October, 1871. He did not, to my recollection, communicate to the Government the fact that he was negotiating with Riel and Lepine. I first became acquainted with it through the public prints, and as to the letter of the 8th October, 1871, by first hearing it read in the House. He never, in any of his communications that I recollect, brought before the Government this evidence of the disposition of the Metis.

The first I heard of an additional sum having been paid to Riel and Lepine was from Mr. Smith, probably at the next Session. He told me that Governor Archibald and himself and Bishop Taché had been apprehensive of an immediate outbreak of the Metis; that Governor Archibald had strongly expressed the opinion that the safety of the country depended on Riel's withdrawal from the country, and that his absence must be procured at all hazards; that the Lieut.-Governor had no money at his disposal, but that if Mr. Smith would advance the necessary sum he had no doubt the Dominion Government would repay it, and mentioned as a proof of the strength of Mr. Archibald's feeling, that there was imminent danger, and that the money must be expended; that Mr. Archibald said, "if the Government repudiate the debt I will pay half, if you run the risk of the other half," or something of that kind. Mr. Smith stated that he had advanced £600 sterling in consequence of this request, either to Mr. Archibald to be given to Bishop Taché, or to Bishop Taché himself; I do not remember which. The largeness of the sum rather staggered me, especially as I had not heard the result of the previous payment; but I did not hesitate to at once tell Mr. Smith that if the Lieut.-Governor, in the presence of such an exigency, had pledged the faith of the Dominion Government, and the money was advanced on

that pledge, that he, Mr. Smith, or the Company, should not be losers, and should be repaid. I stated that there might be a difficulty as to the means or fund out of which he would be repaid; that it would be very embarrassing, if not impossible, to go to Parliament at that time for the money, and I asked him to allow the matter to stand over, repeating the assurance for myself that it must be repaid him in some way or other. I cannot remember any interview or conversation with Governor Archibald about it, although I have taxed my memory on the subject. I of course accepted Mr. Smith's statement. It then became simply a question of when and how. I took no other steps for ascertaining how the matter stood. I remember reference being made by Mr. Smith to a sum of £500 sterling which it was desired to pay to the loyal French. The Governor may have spoken of this and of the £600 also, but I cannot remember. I have never had any doubt in my mind that this money should be paid. I intended that it should be paid. The subject was not formally brought up in Council because I was exceedingly unwilling to bring up the discussion of the Riel affair at all, in consequence of the embarrassment I felt as to the position of my Lower Canadian colleagues. I was anxious to avoid discussion lest the result might be a claim for amnesty, and, in the event of the Cabinet not agreeing upon action, resignation. The consideration of the payment was therefore postponed, as I thought it made little difference to a Company like the Hudson's Bay Company.

Early last November Mr. Smith was very urgent, and I asked him to write me a letter stating the particulars (as he had done before) of the claim, that I might bring it up before Council. He wrote such letter, but this being a few days before resignation no action was taken upon it.

It may have been the £500 that Mr. Smith was most pressing, and that the matter of the £600 came up incidentally, but he urged the payment of the latter sum. I did not think that Mr. Smith was unduly pressing for the £600. On the contrary, I thought he was very considerate. He did make frequent and pressing application for the £500, on the ground that he had made promises which ought to be performed. He said the sum was very insignificant as compared to their services. This sum was to be put into the estimates. I intended to have it put in. (A copy of the letter of Governor Archibald to Archbishop Taché dated 5th September, 1872. Also a copy of the conditions dated 6th September, 1872, upon which Louis Riel proposed to retire in favor of Sir George Cartier. Also letter from Governor Archibald to Archbishop Taché, dated 10th September, 1872. Also letter from Governor Archibald to Archbishop Taché, dated 12th September, 1872. Also telegram from Sir John A. Macdonald to Governor Archibald, dated 12th September, 1872, were here read to Sir John.)

I do not know whether I have the telegram to which the above-mentioned telegram is an answer. I have little doubt that I have it and can find it. I may have put it in an enclosure to Sir George, and will look.

We then knew that Riel was spoken of as a probable candidate.

(Sir John here read the Order in Council of 4th June, 1873, as follows) :—

*“ Copy of a Report of the Honorable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency
“ the Governor General in Council on the 4th June, 1873.*

“ The Committee of the Privy Council beg to submit to Your Excellency, that having
“ their attention called to the desire expressed by the Legislature of Manitoba, and by
“ many of Her Majesty's subjects residing in that Province, that an amnesty should be
“ granted by Her Majesty to those concerned in the disturbances which occurred in the
“ North-West Territories in 1869 and 1870, and the subject having been pressed upon the
“ Government of Canada, whose intervention has been asked, the Committee beg leave to
“ report that these unfortunate occurrences took place before the North-West territory
“ was acquired by the Dominion, and therefore before the Government of Canada had
“ any control over the country, or authority in the administration of its affairs. The
“ Committee very respectfully submit that in their opinion, although the right of extend-
“ ing the clemency of the Crown in criminal cases is amongst the high functions entrusted

" to Your Excellency, the exercise of that power is limited by the Royal instructions to the cases of individual criminals after conviction, and does not confer upon you the power of granting a general amnesty or special pardon before trial. No trials or convictions have yet been had against any one concerned in the troubles referred to, and the Committee of the Privy Council believe that the power to grant the amnesty asked for by the Legislature of Manitoba, rests only with Her Majesty.

" The Legislature of Manitoba having arrived at the conclusion that the time has come when the subject may be dealt with, and having conveyed their opinion in that sense to the Government of the Dominion, the Committee of the Privy Council respectfully request that Your Excellency will be pleased to bring the matter before Her Majesty's Government, in order that such course may be taken as may be thought consistent with the interests of justice and best for the quiet of the country.

" (Certified), W. A. HINSWORTH,
Clerk, Privy Council."

The desire referred to as felt by many of Her Majesty's subjects in the Province, was made known to us both by petitions and verbal communications.

No action was taken on the despatch of 4th July, 1873, in response to the Order in Council. We considered there was no possibility of action being taken against any person other than those implicated in the death of Scott, that therefore the issue of the amnesty in the form proposed would do such persons no good, while the exclusion of those implicated in the death would greatly irritate the Metis who sympathized with Riel.

I thought that if Riel and Lepine were away for a time, and the country perfectly quiet, Her Majesty's Government might see their way to granting a complete amnesty. I intended going to England that summer on private business, and after the answer to our despatch received we considered the matter in so unsatisfactory a shape that I said I would endeavour to press it upon Her Majesty's Government. I thought of getting them to send out a Commissioner.

Another method I thought was, that the Imperial Government might upon discussion, grant a general amnesty without the Canadian Government being responsible for it, to which I would have had no objection. I recollect a conversation with Mr. Langevin and the Archbishop in the fall of 1873, when the seat in Provencher was vacant.

It was said over and over again that it would be most inexpedient for Riel to run; that it would prejudice his own interests, and prevent him obtaining that which he seemed to desire so much, viz., the amnesty.

We pressed upon the Archbishop the necessity of using his influence with Riel, to keep him from running.

The Archbishop said that he would take no further steps; that he had not been well used; that Riel's offence had been simply political.

I have no reason to doubt that I told the Archbishop that I was going to England, and that I would press the Home Government to take up the question and assume the responsibility of disposing of the whole matter. I felt that if the Home Government granted an amnesty it would be loyally accepted by the people, while, if the Canadian Government assumed the responsibility of asking for it, it would have been greatly resented by the people—at any rate of Ontario.

I have no reason to doubt that I conveyed to the Bishop the substance of what I have stated. I do not remember his asking for anything in writing. Mr. Langevin told me that he had asked him to obtain a letter promising the exertions of the Government in favour of procuring an extended amnesty.

The representations I intended to make to the Home Government were to be made by me, as expressing the opinions of the Canadian Government.

I do not think I expressed the opinion to the Bishop that my representations would probably result in the procuring of an amnesty. I did express to him the opinion, that my representations would induce them to assume the responsibility of dealing with the matter.

I could not assume, in the face of their despatch, what their action would be. I stated I would do what I could to get them to take it up and deal with it. I did not state that I would use my exertions to get them to deal with it in the way of giving an amnesty. I do not think I mentioned the commission to the Bishop. I think I said no more than that I was quite sure I would succeed in getting them to take the matter up on their own responsibility.

The Canadian Government felt that they ought not to be called upon to take action in a matter which was so difficult and unpopular. I expressed no opinion that I remember as to how the Home Government were likely to deal with it. I authorized Mr. Langevin to make a communication to his Lower Canadian friends. We were informed that they were going to meet, and that they were very uneasy and desirous of knowing whether the Government were going to do any thing, and if so, what? I authorized him to state that it was my intention to go home and take the course I have indicated in my examination.

There may have been conversation with the Archbishop about the effect of time in this matter, and the analogous cases of W. L. Mackenzie, &c., but I do not remember.

I intended to go to England as soon as possible, and to have pressed the Imperial Government to take the subject up. I had no doubt they would act one way or the other (after communication with the Colonial Minister) without delay.

Mr. Langevin informed me, as he had done before, that unless an amnesty was granted in its most extended sense before the next session, he and Dr. Robitaille would be obliged to retire from the Government, as he believed his friends from Quebec would withdraw their support, and neither he nor Dr. Robitaille could continue to be of any use to us. I expressed an opinion that before that time the Imperial Government would take it up. Mr. Langevin considered if they took it up, his Lower Canadian friends would await the action of the Imperial Government before changing their attitude.

I remember something about two months after the session being mentioned as the time within which so much might be accomplished.

The correspondence relating to the North-West, of a confidential and an unofficial character, until my illness, was principally with me.

While ill it was with Sir George.

After my recovery, it was, I think, principally with me until I went to Washington, when Sir George conducted it.

After my return from Washington, Sir George still continued to conduct most of it.

JOHN A. MACDONALD.

COMMITTEE ROOM,

May 2nd, 1874.

Walter Robert Bown, of Winnipeg, Manitoba, being examined, deposed as follows:—

I went to Fort Garry in 1863, and have resided there since. I was in Manitoba at the time of the commencement of the troubles in 1869. I was at Fort Garry. I trace the origin of the troubles to a period a year or two earlier.

They commenced, I think, in the French half-breeds, the Metis calling, as it was termed, at the church doors in opposition to the *Nov'-Wester*, then the only paper in the country, of which I was firstly editor, and then proprietor.

They endeavored in this way to get the people to destroy the press. A rumor had been got up by some persons to influence the French against me, charging me with writing articles against their religion.

Some time before the actual outbreak the French Metis met at the Fort to discuss, with Governor McTavish, Dr. Cowan and others, the propriety of destroying my press.

This might be a year before the outbreak. They were dissuaded from this course by

my having printed some bills for them. These bills repudiated the action which they said had been taken by Dr. Schultz in the paper before I became proprietor. I was impressed with the belief that Governor McTavish and the authorities were in sympathy with the parties in their action. I so wrote to the Governor, and he repudiated it. I believe that the Hudson's Bay officials were opposed to the institution of a press there. I think they were unwilling that the country should become better known to the world. I heard that they had taken the press for debt. This was in Caldwell's and Buckingham's time.

The next manifestation of discontent, in my opinion, was a meeting called at Fort Garry in 1869, about three or four months before Governor McDougall's arrival.

The meeting was, I think, in the court room, and not within the walls of the Fort. This council-room was the ordinary place of meeting for the people. This meeting was confined to half-breeds, French and English. I think a general invitation to the old inhabitants of the country was given. The invitation was issued by a few French Metis, as I recollect. The object was to discuss the proposed transfer of the country. There was much discontent in the neighborhood. There was a fear that the Canadians might come in and drive out the French, and dispossess them of the lands they were living on.

This did not, so far as I ever heard, extend to the Scotch and English half-breeds. The surveyors were at that time in the country. They were engaged in the survey, but they were not at work on any land actually occupied by Metis. I believe the Metis claimed the lands under an Indian title. There were Metis living in the immediate neighborhood of where the surveyors were working. This had alarmed the people. I think that there had been no demonstration of hostility against the Company in any public demonstration before this. The next I heard was the stockade raising at Stinking River.

I did not understand that there was any discontent, at the time of the first meeting, respecting the proposed constitution of the country. There was no movement on the part of the people, I think, to obtain a voice in the mode of the country being transferred, or in the form of government to be established, until Mr. McDougall's arrival. I do not think the people thought of it particularly.

Besides the fear of losing their lands, and being driven out of the country, the Metis were discontented because they thought they ought to have a part of the £300,000.

Another cause of the uprising was, in my opinion, that certain persons were unwilling to give up power they possessed.

Many officials of the Hudson's Bay Company were dissatisfied because they did not get a share of the £300,000 and of the lands. Mr. Thos. Taylor, who was chief trader at Fort Alexander, said they ought to have a share of the money. He did not express any satisfaction at the rising. Mr. John McTavish made about the same remark. He said nothing about the troubles one way or the other. There might have been others, but I forget who they were. Governor McTavish did not inform me to that effect, nor did Dr. Cowan. I think that some of these dissatisfied parties urged upon the people the idea of resistance to the entrance of the Canadians. I did hear afterwards that the people desired to have a voice in public matters. The first I heard of this was at the meeting after Fort Garry was taken possession of. Up to that time, if discussed, it was only quietly. This meeting was called by the French. A number of them, with Riel, came to my office to get me to print a notice of this meeting, which I refused to do. This notice invited all parties. Both English-speaking and French natives were at the meeting, I think. Up to a certain point there were certain English and Scotch settlers who joined with the French. There were only a few of them. This meeting was not looked upon as a representative one of the English and Scotch settlers. The English-speaking settlers kept aloof, I think. There were only a few of them. I cannot mention names of those who kept away or of those who were there. I can't say whether there was a representation determined upon, to be addressed to Governor McDougall. Although I was living at Fort Garry, I cannot mention the names of any persons who were there or who were not. I cannot speak even from hearsay. I can't say whether Mr. Bunn, Mr.

Fraser, Mr. Tait or Mr. Ross joined in this. The road-makers came there in 1868, in the fall, as I recollect. There was a scarcity occasioned by the failure of crops. The surveyors came in the spring of 1869, I think. The surveyors were not liked because the people were jealous that their lands should be surveyed before they were treated with. There was dissatisfaction against the road-makers, expressed on account of the supplies.

The old inhabitants, both French and English speaking, claimed rights beyond the land they actually occupied; for example, the right of hay-cutting beyond the limit. The surveyors ran over and surveyed the hay lands. I knew of no others except the old settlers taking up portions of land from those claimed by the old settlers except on the Indian reserve. There were settlers at Point du Chêne who had taken up lands.

I was out of the country at the time of the escape from jail. This was done by the English Metis. The French-speaking settlers were opposed to this. They wished to support the Company. I left in December, 1869, and did not return till June, 1870. I went to Monckion's, and after staying there a few days, I went to a fort and remained away until June. I belonged to the so-called Canadian party. I was not with them when the arrest was made.

Previous to any talk of the transfer there was dissatisfaction, on the part of the English settlers and the new-comers from Canada, with the arbitrary rule of the Hudson's Bay Company. I remember there was a little Republic established at the Portage some years before. There were some twenty or thirty people there. They felt that their lives and properties were not properly protected.

The excitement raised by the calling at the church doors was confined to the object of attaching my papers. The French population, two or three times, expressed a desire to be united to Canada, by petitions which they sent down. I can't give the dates; it was previous to the troubles. I think that I have heard that there afterwards was a counter petition.

The Hudson's Bay Company officials, I believe, knew the people were rising, and they took no steps to put them down. They also knew that Riel and others were coming to take the Fort, and they did not close the gates. They also refused the assistance of persons willing to assist in opposing his entrance. The information as to Riel's intention to take the Fort was, as I was told, communicated to the officials by Sergeant Mulligan, Powers, and, I think, James Stewart.

There was a general feeling among all classes of the people that some of the Roman Catholic clergy feared the loss of power consequent upon the immigrants coming in. It was said that owing to the superior education of our people, they and the native settlers could not live together, and that the latter would have to move to the Saskatchewan.

WALTER ROBERT BOWN.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
4th May, 1874.

Thomas Bunn examined:—

I am a farmer. I was born in the North-West. Have resided since 1861 at Mapleton about 22 miles from Winnipeg. Have taken a good deal of interest in public affairs in the North-West.

I was clerk from about 1865 to 1869-70 to the Government and Council of Assiniboia, and to the General Quarterly Court.

I was Secretary to the Provisional Government in February up to the time of its dissolution. I cannot state the time when it was dissolved. I performed my last functions as secretary on the 24th June, 1870, on which day I wrote a letter to Hon. Joseph Howe, Secretary of State.

The first symptoms of discontent of which I am aware were on the 21st Oct., 1869. That was the day that notice was sent to Governor McDougall not to enter the territory. I did not however know of this notice till a few days afterwards. There was before this

a feeling of discontent in the territory, among the French Metis, and among a small portion of the English-speaking population, as well whites as Metis. This discontent was caused by the conduct of Mr. Snow, the Superintendent of the Dawson route, on account of the manner in which he was said to have disposed of the provisions which were sent in aid of the population which was then suffering from the ravages of the grasshoppers.

I have no personal knowledge of Mr. Snow's action, but he was believed to have disposed of them in a different manner from that which was intended, and which was his duty. There was also a feeling of discontent as to the action of some surveyors who were surveying a portion of the country. It was thought that they had no right to come in there until the Canadian Government had been put into possession of the country. Mr. Snow's reputed misconduct tended to promote a feeling of suspicion and dislike of Canadians.

The action of the surveyors was of more importance in producing these feelings than that of Mr. Snow. It was not so much their surveying the lands in any particular place, as the fact of their coming into the country at all for that purpose before it had been transferred.

The surveying was forcibly stopped by the people before the notice was sent to Mr. McDougall. This was by a section of the French Metis, but I do not know the place. There was no tumult or any violence of any consequence used in stopping the surveyors. I believe the Metis merely stepped on the claim, or something of that sort and told them to stop. The French Metis claimed for all the half-breeds a right to the lands of the country generally; but the English half-breeds did not put forth that claim. It is not to my knowledge that the English Metis claim that right. They did not claim the right because there was no action by the surveyors in the neighborhood of the territory which they occupied. I have no doubt that if the surveyors had gone there some action would have been taken by the English half-breeds. The surveyors had been surveying lands in the neighborhood of those possessed by the French half-breeds, and it was rumoured that they were crossing some of them. As early as 1868 it was believed that large tracts of land were bought from the Indians, and that liquor was given for them, and this also created considerable discontent. It was said that the lands that were bought included lands that had been occupied by old residents.

It was very generally believed or apprehended among the people generally, but to a greater extent among the French half-breeds, that the whole country would be appropriated or monopolized by new comers. I myself shared that apprehension. I mean by the new comers purchasing the lands from the Indians, and thereby extinguishing the Indian title.

I was aware that the Indian title could not be extinguished by private individuals, but they might have obtained possession and claimed pre-exemption from the Government afterwards. There was no objection among the English half-breeds to the extinguishment of the Indian title by the proper authority, nor do I think there would be any by the French half-breeds when the Canadian Government should have been regularly put in possession.

I understood that the French Metis claimed that the country belonged to the half-breeds under the same kind of title by which Indians claim, namely, by birth, residence and occupation.

They claim no transfer from the Indians. The English half-breeds do not make this kind of claim, though, as I have said, they probably would have taken some action if the surveyors had come into their neighbourhood.

There was also a considerable deal of discontent produced by certain letters from a person in the settlement to the "Globe" newspaper during the year 1868, as far as I can remember. These letters contributed to create a feeling of irritability and discontent against Canadians, that is, people from Canada; more particularly against Canadians who were expected to come in; and they were excited against Mr. Mair, who was said to be the writer of those letters, and who was employed under Mr. Snow on the Dawson Road. These letters were considered to be insulting in their description of the native population,

that is, the half-breeds. There was also a feeling of dissatisfaction among the people generally, but more particularly among the French, at the people being ignored in the negotiations between the Imperial Government, the Canadian Government, and the Hudson's Bay Company.

The English portion of the community had many persons among them who had influence, and who prevented excitement. The English clergy were friendly to the Canadian Government, and they had great influence with their congregations.

I believe that if the same influence had been used upon the English population that was used upon the French, they might have joined the French, and might have led to an easier solution of the difficulty. People generally had not taken much interest in the transfer, and were taken by surprise when the action was taken against Mr. McDougall by the French. I believe the French were guided by intelligent men. From their mode of action I believe that they were influenced by intelligence superior to that of the general body of the actors who appeared on the scene. I can name no one, except Riel, who is a man of intelligence. The mass of the people would have taken no action if they had not been influenced by some persons of superior intelligence. I may mention in addition to Riel, John Bruce. It would have been difficult for any person or any two persons to sway the English against the counteracting influence of the clergy to which I have referred. I am not aware that the Catholic clergy have as great influence with their congregations as the English clergy had in counteracting any action of that kind. I am not aware, either from rumour or by my knowledge, that the French clergy took the same course as the English did, in dissuading their congregations from action. When the difficulty first arose, there was no discontent among the people in the neighbourhood where I resided. There was none evinced until the giving of the notice to Governor McDougall. They did not become discontented when they first heard that the country was being transferred. It was not for some time afterwards. No other cause of the difficulties occurs to me.

The first result of the discontent was the warning to Governor McDougall against entering the country. This movement was rather spontaneous. It did not take the people long to make up their minds. It was understood in the territory that this warning was signed by Mr. Bruce. The next action on the part of the people was that they entered Fort Garry. I was at home when this occurred. I received a notice signed by Riel, to join with others of the English people for a convention to be held at Fort Garry. This was the first personal intimation I had of any action on the part of the people. I attended the meeting on the 16th November. I found Louis Riel and eleven other gentlemen who represented French parishes, and eleven gentlemen representing English parishes.

This meeting resulted in the framing and unanimous adoption of the first Bill of Rights for presentation to Governor McDougall. I was elected by the unanimous vote of the large majority of the people of my parish who were present at a meeting, and I believe the other representatives were elected by the majorities in their respective parishes. The objects for which they were chosen was to consider what was best for the interests of the country. It was proposed that a deputation, composed of two English and two French representatives, should present the Bill of Rights to Governor McDougall, and to ask him whether, by virtue of his commission, he could assure them that the "Bill of Rights" could be secured to the people. The English-speaking portion declined to name a deputation, for the reason that they knew that Governor McDougall could not secure the granting of the Bill of Rights, and therefore it was unnecessary to go. They proposed no alternative course. Before any final conclusion was arrived at as to the best mode of endeavouring to secure the Bill of Rights, Colonel Dennis entered with the proclamation of Governor McDougall and terminated the convention abruptly, according to my recollection. The unanimous agreement as to the Bill of Rights had, I believe, a soothing effect. It led to the idea of a union, and in fact effected a sort of union for the time.

The whole population, through their representatives, assented to the Bill of Rights. There was a small party, called the Canadian party, who did not concur. They numbered from 40 to 60 perhaps.

They were distributed about in various parts of the territory, but were principally in the neighbourhood of Fort Garry.

From the date of Colonel Dennis' entry there was a separation between the French and English for a time.

The effect of the proclamation upon the French was to make them strengthen themselves in Fort Garry. It increased their irritation. Its effect upon the English people is difficult to state. It was very varied. It confused them for a time. I left the Fort the day after Colonel Dennis entered. The other English delegates also left for their homes. I returned to Fort Garry on the 19th January, 1870.

I know nothing about the second branch of the Committee's enquiries.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
5th May, 1874.

Thomas Bunn's evidence continued :—

As to the third branch of enquiry in the Order of Reference :—

I was in Winnipeg acting as secretary to the Provisional Government when Archbishop Taché arrived there, which was before the 9th March, 1870.

A meeting of the Council of the Provisional Government was then called. It was composed of delegates from the English and French parishes. It was called by a notice addressed to each member by Mr. Louis Schmidt, acting as sub-secretary, under the orders of Mr. Riel as President. They probably all got notice, and nearly all, if not all, were present. The meeting was on the 9th March, and I was present at it. None of the population were present but the Council, to the best of my recollection. This Council was created by election in the different parishes on or about the 28th February, 1870. The first proposition to have delegates was made at a mass meeting, called by Mr. Donald A. Smith, who, I think, was then under guard; or by some official of the Hudson's Bay Company. This meeting appointed a Committee which divided the portion of territory occupied by the English into electoral divisions, and settled the mode of election, and each of these sent a delegate or delegates. They did this by giving a double representation to the larger parishes. I know that the people were called together in all those electoral divisions to elect delegates, but I do not know that the French were called together for that purpose, nor do I know that it was necessary, because nothing was said about French delegates at the mass meeting. Under this system the first body of delegates was chosen. It had been understood that the English and French speaking population should adopt such method as they respectively chose. This has been generally called the Convention of January. The Council to which I have referred as meeting Archbishop Taché was appointed after the formation of the Provisional Government which had been formed by the Convention. I cannot say how the French delegates, who were called to the meeting of the 9th March, were elected. At this meeting Bishop Taché addressed them, and after speaking of his regret for some things that had happened, and stating that he had been commissioned by the Canadian Government, to see them, urged them to be united as they had formerly been, and said that an amnesty had been granted. He spoke of it, to the best of my recollection, as a general amnesty. He did not produce the proclamation promising the amnesty, nor did he read it. I think he said a proclamation had been issued, but I cannot be sure. To the best of my recollection Bishop Taché did not say anything as to any conditions on which the amnesty was granted, nor anything to the effect that the people were to retire to their homes or to be quiet. He did not require that they should give up their Government at that time. He asked Mr. Riel to release immediately half of the prisoners. I do not think he gave any reason for asking only half; but the half were released. I cannot remember if he asked first for the release of all the prisoners. That part of the conversation was in French, and though I understood that language I would not be so likely to remember it. The matter he spoke of as regrettable was the death of Scott, but he did not make any exception of any one on that account

in speaking of the amnesty. There was no doubt expressed of the amnesty including every one. What the Bishop said appeared to give general satisfaction.

I do not know if it was known that the news of Scott's death had not reached Ottawa when Bishop Taché left there, but no remark was made on that subject at the meeting. I do not think the Bishop actually mentioned Scott's death at that meeting, but merely alluded to some circumstances as being to be regretted, which, I think, was generally understood to refer to Scott's death. A good many people did not believe that Scott was dead, but I think those present at the meeting of delegates must have believed it. I believe that the promise of amnesty was understood to include those who were concerned in the death of Scott.

The meeting of delegates was convened for general business.

Mr. Riel and his followers did not lay down their arms after Bishop Taché had addressed them, and promised them an amnesty, nor did Bishop Taché require them to do so.

Mr. Riel kept the remainder of the prisoners in custody for some time afterwards, releasing them gradually until on or about the 22nd of March, when I think the last was released, and he and his party remained under arms in pretty strong force, until the arrival, on the 24th June, of Father Ritchot; and they did not altogether disperse, to the best of my knowledge, until the arrival of Colonel Wolseley. But there were very few there for some time previous to Colonel Wolseley's arrival.

After the meeting of the 9th March, the delegates went home, and were from time to time summoned again. They had one or two meetings on the 9th March. The Council never demanded the release of the prisoners. I can hardly say what its powers were. It was merely devised to keep the country quiet, as there needed to be some Government. It had its last meeting on the 23rd June, to receive the report of Father Ritchot. It had a meeting or meetings in the month of May, at which certain laws were passed: for a tariff on imports, about the hay, the prevention of crime, and the like. This Council had nothing to do with the executive part of the Government. That was conducted by the actual Provisional Government, that is Louis Riel and some other officers whose names I forget.

There was a promise made by Riel at the Convention of January, that the prisoners should be released. This promise was not carried out, because, as I understood, and as he told me himself, Riel heard that certain parties were preparing to release them by force.

The Commissioner who went around to induce the people to elect representatives to the Council of February, represented to them as one reason for taking part in the election that it was to save the life of Major Boulton, and probably a release of the prisoners, but of the latter I am not sure. This was in February, not long after the formation of the Provisional Government.

It was also stated by the Commissioner that the Convention was for the purpose of making arrangements for going into union with Canada.

Notices of the election of the delegates from the English parishes were to be given to me as secretary of the Provisional Government as I understood it. This was by direction of the Commissioner, Mr. Smith. I understood that he objected to the notice of the results of the election being sent to Riel. In some cases the elected members addressed their notices to Riel and in some to me.

I produce a number of these papers as follows:—

(No. 71.)

" Letter from E. H. G. G. Hay, to Thomas Bunn, enclosed in an envelope addressed to
" Thomas Bunn, Esq., Secretary of Provisional Government."

" Thomas Bunn, Esq.

" SIR,—I have to inform you that at a public meeting held this day in the school-

" house of St. Andrew's, Mr. T. Sinclair, Jun., and E. H. G. G. Hay were duly elected as
" Councillors to the Provisional Government.

" I am, Sir,

" Yours respectfully,

" (Signed,) EDWD. H. G. G. HAY,

" Secretary.

" Saturday, 19th February, 1870."

(No. 72.)

Thomas Spence to Louis Riel.

" HEADINGLY, 23rd February, 1870.

" SIR,—As chairman of a public meeting held at the Parish Church on Tuesday last,
" the 22nd instant, for the election of a Councillor to represent the Parish in the Council
" of the Provisional Government, I have the honor to inform you that Mr. William Tait,
" farmer, is the duly elected Councillor for the Parish of Headingly.

" I have the honor to be, Sir,

" Your most obedient servant,

" (Signed,) THOMAS SPENCE.

" To Louis Riel, Esq.,

" President of the Provisional Government
" of Rupert's Land."

(No. 73.)

W. Caldwell to Louis Riel.

" ST. JOHN'S PARISH,

" Red River Settlement, Feb. 25rd, 1870.

" Louis Riel, Esq.,

" President Provisional Government.

" SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that a public meeting of the inhabitants of
" St. John's Parish, and the Town of Winnipeg, was held this day in St. John's school-
" house; Venerable Archdeacon McLean in the Chair. After hearing Mr. James Ross,
" the delegate from St. John's Parish, in reference to the proceedings of the recent Anglo-
" French Convention, the meeting accorded to him their thanks for his labours, approved
" his course, and agreed to send a member to serve at the Council Board of the new
" Provisional Government.

" Mr. James Ross and Mr. Colin Inkster having declined election, Mr. A. G. B.
" Bannatyne, of the Town of Winnipeg, was chosen representative of the joint consti-
" tuency by a unanimous vote.

" I am, Sir,

" Yours respectfully,

" (Signed,) W. CALDWELL,

" Secretary of the Meeting."

(No. 74.)

James Murray to Louis Riel.

" KILDONAN, 22nd February, 1870.

" Louis Riel, President

" Provisional Government.

" SIR,—I beg to inform you that at a meeting of the people of this parish, held last
" night, Mr. William Fraser was unanimously chosen as Councillor for this parish, in the
" Provisional Government.

" I am, Sir,

" Yours respectfully,

" (Signed,) JAMES MURRAY,

" Secretary of the Meeting."

(No. 75.)

Resolutions passed at a public meeting of the Parish of St. Clement, Red River, held in the Parish School-room, February 22nd, 1870. Mr. John Pruden, Chairman.

" 1st. Moved by Mr. Bunn, seconded by Joseph Whiteway,—That we the inhabitants of the Parish of St. Clements, do now acknowledge and hereby declare ourselves subject to a Provisional Government, about to be formed under Louis Riel as President, and a Council consisting of twenty-four members, of whom twelve shall be English and twelve French. Carried unanimously.

" 2nd. Moved by Mr. Thomas Folster, seconded by John McKay,—That Mr. Thomas Bunn be, and is hereby elected and appointed as the Representative Member of this Parish in the Council of the said Provisional Government.

" 3rd. Moved by Alex Mackenzie, seconded by Joseph Whiteway,—That this meeting hopes that one of the first results in response to this present action of the English people, will be an amnesty to all political prisoners now in confinement, and that peace and good feeling will be once more restored throughout the whole settlement.

" (Signed,) JOHN KIPPLING,
" Secretary.

" (Signed,) JOHN PRUDEN,
" Chairman.

" To Thos. Bunn, Esq.,
" Secy. Provisional Government,
" Mapleton, February 23rd, 1870."

(No. 76.)

" February 23rd, 1870.

" This is to certify that Mr. George Gunn has been duly elected representative at a public meeting, by the citizens of St. Anns, for the Council under the Provisional Government of Rupert's Land.

" (Signed,) FRED BIRD,
" Chairman.

" (Signed,) DAVID TAIT,
" Secretary."

(No. 77.)

" At a public meeting held in the Parish of St. Peter's this 22nd day of February, in the year of Our Lord 1870, Mr. John Sinclair was unanimously elected Councillor for the said Parish of St. Peter's to the Provisional Government, which we consent to join in the same way as the other English Parishes do.

" (Signed,) JAMES ASHAM,
" Chairman."

(No. 78.)

" March 1st, 1870.

" These are to certify that John Norquay, sen., has been duly elected by public meeting of the parishioners of St. Margaret's Parish to represent them in the Council of the Provisional Government now established in the Territory.

" (Signed,) JOHN NORQUAY, JUN.,
" (Signed,) GEORGE ADAMS."

(No. 79.)

" At a meeting of the citizens of the Parish of St. Anns at the school-house on the 28th February, A.D., 1870, David Spence was elected Chairman, and F. H. Byrr, Secretary.

" After some discussion, it was resolved,—That as there was supposed to be some in-

"formality in the election of George Gunn as our representative to the Council, which might result in his non-acceptance, we do consider it necessary to re-elect him. Carried unanimously.

"It was moved by Peter Taylor, and seconded by James Brown,—That George Gunn be re-elected. Carried.

"George Gunn then having received a majority of the votes, he was declared re-elected.

"Moved by David Spence, and seconded by John Smith,—That Abraham Foulds be chosen to bear these minutes of this meeting, together with the accompanying declaration of submission to the Provisional Government, to our delegate George Gunn. Carried.

" (Signed,)	DAVID SPENCE, " Chairman.
" (Signed,)	F. H. BURE, " Secretary."

(No. 80.)

" ST. MARY'S, LAPRAIRIE,
" March 1st, 1870.

" At a public meeting, numerously attended, it was moved by Mr. Shannon, and seconded by Mr. J. Macomister,—That Messrs. F. Bird and F. Ogletree be appointed to make out the credentials to shew the election of the representatives from this parish. —Carried unanimously.

" We, the undersigned, hereby certify that at the above meeting it was moved, seconded, and unanimously carried, that William Garnock, Esq., be elected to represent us in the Provisional Government now established in this Territory.

" Signed on behalf of the Public }	" (Signed,)	FRED. A. BIRD.
" of Laprairie, }	" (Signed,)	FRANCIS OGLETREE."

At the convention of January, a Sub-Committee was appointed to name officers.

The officers unanimously agreed to by that Sub-Committee for proposal to the convention for election were: myself, as Secretary; O'Donoghue, as Treasurer; James Ross, as Chief Justice; Bannatyne, as Postmaster General; and others for other offices whose names I forget. The Sub-Committee made no recommendation as to the President. Those recommended by the Sub-Committee were elected by the convention unanimously. The President was appointed by the convention by vote, after the Sub-Committee had left this blank. The election of the President was not unanimous. There was a good deal of excitement over the election in the convention. There was a great majority for Riel. Certain members who were absent said, next morning, that if they had been present they would have voted for Riel. There were two of these, and they were English representatives. The French representatives were unanimous for Riel.

I think the members were perfectly free to vote as they pleased. The convention was composed of men of good standing in the community, especially the English members.

Among the Sub-Committee was Dr. Bird, now Speaker of the House. I also was a member; so also were Messrs. James Ross and O'Donoghue. I think Louis Schmidt was one. I produce the original of the first resolution proposed at the meeting of Council, which was subsequently addressed by Archbishop Taché:—

(No. 81.)

Resolution.

(Copy.)

"That notwithstanding the insults and sufferings borne by the people of the North-West heretofore, and the sufferings which they still endure, the loyalty of the people of the North-West towards the Crown of England remains the same: Provided their rights, properties, usages and customs be respected—feeling assured that as British subjects, such rights, properties, usages and customs will be respected."

It was placed in my hands by Louis Riel with the request that I would move it. It was thereupon seconded and unanimously carried.

I have no other papers in my possession here, material to the enquiry.

The people were still enduring sufferings. They were lying out at night; marching from one end of the country to the other, and some were killed.

We were also away from our places under the necessity of forming this Government.

I believe Sutherland had been killed and that Parisien also had been killed.

Parisien it was said had killed Sutherland. Of this latter fact I am convinced. My impression is that Parisien was a fugitive from Riel, and that there was some misapprehension as to his true position.

I believe the reason why Mr. Boulton was in confinement was because he was found in arms against Louis Riel. I do not know why he was condemned to death, unless it was for the same reason. I do not know how he was tried. I have no personal knowledge that he had been condemned to death, but I believe this to have been the case, and it was so believed generally.

I was in the country but not at the Fort, when Father Ritchot and Colonel DeSalaberry arrived. I know nothing of what took place between them and Riel.

I was at the mass meeting when Mr. Smith said he had not a copy of the proclamation of 6th December; that he could not obtain it; but he stated its effect, which was that it contained an amnesty conditional upon their laying down their arms.

He said that the copy of the proclamation had been taken from whomsoever had had it; that something had occurred to prevent his producing it. He appealed to me, as chairman, to request its production. I did so, but it was refused. I do not remember if any reason for the refusal was given. He read what was called the Queen's letter, *i. e.*, the telegram from Lord Granville.

He read the letter from the Governor General to himself, guaranteeing the people's rights. He also read the instructions given to Governor McDougall.

This was the first occasion, I think, upon which many of these papers, including the precise instructions given to Mr. McDougall, came to the knowledge of the people of the territory.

The terms offered by Mr. Smith were not complied with. At the time of this meeting, the terms were not accepted by the French and some of the English, the English as a whole not being content to accept the explanations given from Canada.

The French had not the same confidence in the promises made. The French were not an unit. The French people expressed want of confidence in the Dominion Government.

I never knew of any reason why a general amnesty was not proclaimed.

I was not at the Fort at the time of Scott's death. I did not know that he had been in jail. I do not know where the Record of the Proceedings of the Provisional Government is. There were other resolutions besides that produced.

They were published in the *New Nation* from time to time, and I read them there at the time, and I then believed and now believe them to be substantially correct.

Mr. Bannatyne was a member of the Council.

THOS. BUNN.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
6th May, 1874.

Andrew Graham Bellenden Bannatyne deposed:—Has lived 26 years in the North-west Territory, and was a member of the Council there. Was one of the Council under the Hudson's Bay Government. It was understood by every one in the territory that arrangements were going on in England for the transfer of the territory. The Council was a fair and equal representation of all classes and races in the settlement. We were surrounded by Indians on all sides in 1862, and a petition was sent by the people to England about that time, stating the weakness of the Government there. No attention

was paid to it. The *Nor'-Wester*, a newspaper published there, constantly misrepresented the actions of the Government and the feelings of the people as a whole: this caused such a feeling of annoyance among the settlers, that they got up a petition contradicting the statements made in that paper, and expressing satisfaction with the existing Government of the territory, which was signed by more than 800 people, both French and English; and they asked the proprietors of this paper to print it. They at first refused, but they afterwards printed it on a flysheet, but not in the paper itself. Drs. Schultz and Bown were the proprietors and editors of the paper. After a short time, the Dominion Government sent up men to the territory for opening a road towards the North-west Angle: the reason assigned then was that the people were in a starving condition, and this work was provided for them. This was partly caused by this newspaper publishing a statement that the Government of the country was doing nothing for the people in providing food during the famine, which was untrue. These officials, sent from Canada, commenced purchasing land from the Indians, paying for it with provisions and spirits. The land they were purchasing was already partly numbered or claimed by settlers, who complained to the local Government. Matters began to look serious. One of these officials was summoned to appear at the Court for selling liquor to Indians, and was fined \$50. Matters were explained to these officials by Governor McTavish, and they then desisted, and matters calmed down for the time. The explanation was, as I understood, that Mr. McTavish assumed that it was not right that these lands should be purchased, as they had been surveyed and partly settled before. Some of these officials wrote to papers in Canada, and *misrepresented* the actions of the local Government, stating that they would soon have another Government there, and then they would teach the Government and the people in the territory about law. These officials charged the people £3 12s. stg. for a barrel of flour, while it could be purchased for cash at £5. This caused dissatisfaction. They worked for some officials, and got orders on a store, kept by Dr. Schultz for their pay, which were afterwards cashed by Dr. Bown. Soon after this a number of surveyors arrived in the country. This increased the dissatisfaction. Rumours were reaching the settlement through the newspapers, that the territory was being transferred to the Dominion of Canada; no official information on the subject had been yet received. The *Globe* wrote articles, that if the people received such a Government as was likely to be sent to them they were wrong. The Hon. Wm. McDougall and Schultz shortly afterwards arrived at Pembina. Public meetings were called in different parts of the settlement, and Mr. McDougall's party was stopped, or requested not to come further. The Governor and Council of Assiniboia met about the 30th October, 1869, to receive a letter from Governor McDougall to Governor McTavish. The letter was explained to the Council, and an answer sent back. These are in the blue book; and what was then done was by the advice and consent of the Council. There was also a second letter sent to the Governor and Council, and an answer returned to Mr. McDougall. This appears in the blue book. At one of these meetings of the Governor and Council, an address of welcome to Mr. McDougall had been prepared.

Afterwards matters went on, and the people of all the parishes gathered together a formal convention. They elected members from each side, half from the French and half from the English (representing English, French, Scotch and other nationalities). This convention sat until 30th November and framed a Bill of Rights, and it passed by the convention unanimously. I was not one of the members. On the 1st or 2nd December Mr. McDougall issued a proclamation announcing that he was Governor. The English party stood aloof for part of that day. They felt paralyzed for a time, and stated that the French party, who were still sitting in convention and waiting for them, should be notified of the proclamation which some of the English party doubted to be genuine. The English party requested me to take the proclamation to where the convention was sitting, which I did, and told them the reason that the English party had not met that day was, that Col. Dennis had brought a proclamation into the territory, that the country had been transferred to Canada, and that Mr. McDougall was Governor; they said it was impossible, and they would not believe it. I said I would get a copy of the proclamation, and if they

liked I would show it to them. They requested me to do so, and I showed it to them.

Riel immediately called his people's attention, and said that now more than ever they would require to be cool; that they had always stated they were British subjects, and that they were loyal to their Queen and Country, but he could not think that this could be a genuine proclamation, he doubted it; that surely the English authorities would not so ignore the rights of the people as to transfer them without even consulting them. He said also that if this were really genuine the English people would surely come up to the convention and meet them. I said I would write a note to the English party and ask them to come up; and I did so, and they came. They sat for a few minutes, explained matters to each other, and agreed to meet again in half an hour. They jointly continued with the Bill of Rights, after they met again, and decided to send two delegates from each side to see Mr. McDougall if he was still at Pembina. The French appointed their two delegates, but the English did not, as they said that they knew that Mr. McDougall had no authority to guarantee their rights, which was the object the delegation were to have in view. Does not know if the French delegates went. Mr. McDougall issued several proclamations. Col. Dennis commenced trying to arm the people in opposition to the French; took possession of the Lower Fort Garry; enlisted a number of Indians with their chief; failed in getting the old settlers to join him, and left in disgust; and then found out at Pembina, or somewhere else, that he had no authority for acting as he had been doing. While at the Lower Fort he sent up and enrolled a number of strangers, who had just come in, and who were called the Canadian party; the men were requested by Col. Dennis to return to their homes, and remain quiet until he asked for them; instead of which they gathered in the house of Dr. Schultz with their arms, in Winnipeg, for the reason, as they stated, that they were protecting private property of Dr. Schultz and of the Dominion Government, although neither kind of property had been interfered with at that time to my knowledge. The Government property there was pork and flour, in a small store adjoining the other premises, and a guard had already been placed over this property by the French party, by order of Governor McTavish as the agent of Mr. Snow.

The French party were then in arms. The Canadian party remained in their houses for several days, Col. Dennis stating that he had ordered them to retire, or that they were there contrary to his orders, which was a constant menace to the French. Col. Dennis issued another proclamation about the 5th December; this is also in the blue book. Mr. Snow went to Upper Fort Garry with one Mr. McArthur, met the French party, offered them written conditions of surrender, and the French party accepted them. While these conditions were with them, a report came that the French were coming down to fire upon the party assembled at Dr. Schultz's house. I said that we must get all the inhabitants together and throw ourselves between them, but Riel told me that the report was entirely untrue. Fort Garry was taken possession of by the French party about 2nd November; on the 6th November a notice was issued by the French party signed, I think, by Riel as Secretary from a Council formed by them, of which Bruce was President at the time Mr. McDougall was at Pembina, requesting the English people to send delegates from each of their townships to meet them, and the convention was formed, of which I have already spoken. Fort Garry was taken possession of by the French party, and without the knowledge or consent of Governor McTavish, or in fact any one else, except their own party. There had been no guard in the Fort in the day time, but there was a watchman there at night. The Fort, since the withdrawal of the troops from there, had been used merely as a place of business.

A. G. B. BANNATYNE.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
7th May, 1874.

Examination of A. G. B. Bannatyne continued:—

Has no knowledge of the causes which have retarded the granting of the amnesty announced in the proclamation issued by the late Governor General of Canada, on 6th December, 1869.

In January, 1870, a mass meeting of all the people was held at Fort Garry, when Mr. Donald A. Smith addressed the meeting, read letters which are in the blue book ; but I cannot characterize any of them ; and promised the people that if they would only work together, that all, notwithstanding what had arisen, would be arranged, and that he could promise amnesty to all parties who had been engaged in the disturbances. I was present at this meeting and acted as secretary on the second day. I cannot say whether Mr. Smith or any one else read the proclamation or not. All the papers that Mr. Smith asked for, I believe were read, but nothing was said to the people as far as I can remember, about laying down their arms, or about their becoming peaceable and loyal subjects, and submitting to the law.

Mr. Smith, was introduced to the meeting, and announced himself as a Commissioner from the Canadian Government, and read a letter from that Government to that effect. Remembers that a letter was read by Mr. Smith, which was signed "John Young." Mr. Smith being asked if that was the Governor General of Canada, said he was ; but I do not remember what the substance of that letter was. I do not know how the letters or papers came into the possession of the Provisional Government, but they were produced by the Secretary of that Government, Mr. Schmidt, on Riel question ; there was much discussion about the production of those letters, but I cannot say whether a strong effort was made to prevent them being read.

After the mass meeting the people were again in convention about 15th March, 1870. It was a meeting of the Provisional Government, elected by the several parishes. I was there as a representative from St. John's and Winnipeg. We were advised by Archbishop Taché, who stated that he was very happy to see the people united. He trusted there would be peace in the country. That he had been summoned as a Commissioner from Rome, representing, as I understood, both the Imperial and Dominion Governments, and we understood that, in that capacity, he promised us that there would be a general amnesty, covering all past acts, and it was only after this statement that we really felt that we would have no civil war. After this the Provisional Government went on peaceably until the arrival of Col. Wolseley. The delegates to Canada had been appointed at the instance of the convention in January, and Archbishop Taché urged that they should be sent immediately. Did not hear the Archbishop read any proclamation of amnesty at the meeting above referred to, but I had understood that he had read or explained the proclamation to certain parties there. The delegates were sent to Canada soon after, and brought with them the Bill of Rights which had been prepared by the Provisional Government ; I believe that it was the same that was prepared by the Convention. In the following June, when the Provisional Government were in Session, the delegates returned from Canada and told us that a general amnesty was granted. The Rev. Mr. Ritchot was the delegate, who made this statement to the Provisional Government ; the other delegate, Mr. Scott, told me the same personally. Does not know of any other promises of amnesty before Confederation. Since Confederation I have been appointed a member of the North-west Council by the Canadian Government, and also Police Magistrate and Postmaster. The people did not lay down their arms on Mr. Taché's statement, but they continued only for the peace of the country. The same state of things continued after the Archbishop's statement at the request of the Convention, until the arrival of Col. Wolseley. I believe that Mr. Smith promised that if the English party joined in the election of delegates to the Provisional Government that the prisoners would be released, and Major Boulton would not be executed. This I understood was promised by Riel as well as Mr. Smith, and that Archdeacon McLean, who accompanied Mr. Smith, I understood also made the same promise. No question was raised, to my knowledge, of the English delegates not acting in the Provisional Government, unless they were promised that Major Boulton should not be executed.

A. G. B. BANNATYNE.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
8th May, 1874.

William Cowan, M. D., deposed:—Have lived in the territory about twenty-three years in the service of the Hudson's Bay Company. One of the causes of the disturbances was discontent with the conduct of Canadians who had come into the country; another was the report of the transfer of the country by the Hudson's Bay Company to Canada, without the people being consulted; another, that the Canadian Government was coming into the country, without sufficient arrangements being made before-hand with the people. I state these as the reports that I heard, and I know of two circumstances that gave force to these causes, the weakness of the Hudson's Bay Company in the settlement, and the general ignorance in Canada of the country and people. I date the weakness of the Company's Government from 1857, when the English-speaking people became dissatisfied, while the French continued well affected to the Company. This arose from the investigation of the Company's officers in England, and the discussions that took place in consequence, both in England and in this country. As long as the Canadian Rifles were in the settlement there was quiet and order; but when they were withdrawn, and the Indian massacre took place in Minnesota, the people petitioned the Imperial Government to replace the troops, and when the petition was refused dissatisfaction again arose. The next great difficulty after that was in the spring of 1863, arising from the trial of an Englishman for a criminal offence in the settlement, for which he was convicted. He had been a rather prominent opponent of the Company politically, and on that ground a strong feeling was created in the settlement in his favor among the English. During the first months of his confinement there were frequent threats of taking him out of gaol by force, and at the end of two months a petition was presented to Governor Dallas for his release. But the Governor referred it to the judge and magistrate, who recommended that it should not be granted, and it was not granted. The friends of the prisoner soon after assembled at a Session of the Petty Court, and when the Court was over they broke the gaol and released the prisoner. The following day one of the gaol-breakers was arrested and imprisoned, and an application was made for his release, which was refused by the Governor, and his friends came there armed and in broad day took him out of prison. The sheriff had endeavored to raise a force among the English to defend the gaol, and could not, and the French then came forward and offered themselves to the Governor for that purpose; the Governor refused this on the ground that he did not wish to set one portion of the people against the other. A strong memorial arising out of the matter was sent by the magistrate to the Imperial authorities for assistance, but no answer to it was ever received. This added to the dissatisfaction; one or two minor matters afterwards occurred. No assistance came from England. The Hudson's Bay Government grew continually weaker, until finally the outbreak took place. Before this occurred Col. Dennis had commenced a survey under the directions of the Canadian Government, and complained to me that he had been obstructed in his work by Louis Riel. I sent for another magistrate, Mr. Goulet, and Riel coming into the post at the time, I sent for him, and he came before us. We told him of the complaint, and in answer, he said they had no right to survey nor had they any right in the country whatever. We explained to him that the survey could do them no harm, but would rather be an advantage, and that it was quite legal as the Company had consented to it. Riel finally said he would think over what we said, and would come on the following day and give his answer. He came the following day, and I took him to Governor McTavish, who discussed the whole matter with him for two or three hours. He explained to him that he was acting illegally, and that the survey would not in any way affect their lands or their rights. The complaint was allowed to drop by the magistrates, as we thought that after the explanations that had been made there would be no further difficulty, as there was no opposition to the survey in other parts of the settlement, where they were then surveying. We failed to influence the French, because I think that they thought that we were coming under the influence of the Canadians, and were working in accord with the Canadian Government.

Soon after this we heard that Mr. McDougall was coming in as Governor, with others

to act with him in the Government, and that the French intended to oppose him, and they were assembling at Rivière Salé for that purpose. As soon as we were assured that the Governor was coming in, the Council of Assiniboia was called by Governor McTavish. The Council met presided over by Judge Black, as Governor McTavish was ill, and it was then unanimously resolved that an address of welcome should be presented to Mr. McDougall, and the address was accordingly prepared. This was on the 19th October. On the 22nd October, the affidavit I now produce was made before me :—

(No. 82.)

" *Red River Settlement,* }

" To wit : }

" Walton Hyman, of the Parish of St. Norbert, in the said Settlement, Tanner and Currier, maketh oath and saith, as follows :—

" During the afternoon of yesterday, some twenty men or thereabouts, fully armed, made their appearance at the crossing of the River Salé, on the road between here and Pembina; and other and smaller parties of men, also armed, kept coming in during the afternoon and evening, till as many as forty were in the party. That the said party of forty men are now billeted (or were, when the deponent left home, this a.m., at which time they had sent off some men for more provisions) round in the adjacent houses; that the men composing the said party, deponent believes, all belong to the Parishes of St. Norbert above mentioned, and St. Vital, and that the avowed object of meeting in arms and waiting at the said point, was to turn back the new Governor, Mr. McDougall, and bid him not to enter farther into the colony. One of the men, in conversation with the deponent, who was naturally anxious to find out the meaning of such an assemblage with arms in their hands, told the deponent that the above was their object; and further said, that if the Governor persisted in attempting to come farther than that point, i. e., the crossing of the River Salé, they would shoot him. The deponent saith further, that he was informed by this party, and believes the same (inasmuch as he saw a number of horsemen passing previously), that another party mounted, supposed to consist of twenty men or more, are now in advance somewhere about Scratching River, accompanied by a man named Riel, whose intention it is to stop the Governor and submit to him several questions or rather demands, in the event of refusing which, he is to be warned not to proceed.

" There is a farther and new party between the two points mentioned, which this deponent, from information received, believes to number forty men.

" Should the Governor persist in coming forward, notwithstanding repeated warnings, these parties will fall back on the reserve at the River Salé, and there final action will be taken, as above mentioned, should he still further endeavour to force his way on to the Settlement.

" The deponent further saith, that among other houses in the vicinity, where certain of the forty men at the River Salé are billeted, ten of the armed party find quarters at the house of the Curé the Reverend Père Ritchot.

" Finally, that this deponent seriously believes that the said men are truly in earnest, and that without prompt action be taken by the authorities to avert the same, a serious calamity is about to ensue in an outrage, which may be of a fatal character, on the person of the Honorable Gentleman now about entering the Colony to assume the charge of the Government.

" (Signed,) WALTON HYMAN.

" Sworn before me at Fort Garry, }

" this 22nd day of October, 1869. }

" (Signed,) WILLIAM COWAN, J.P."

I at once took it to Governor McTavish, who at once called another Council. That Council met on the 25th October. Riel was there, introduced by one of the Council, to explain the reason of the movement. A lengthy discussion took place on the subject of

this affidavit, and of the movement generally, and Riel said that he would consider what had been said, and give his answer to Mr. McTavish. One of the Council, a French member, said after Riel left, that the older French people had approved of the movement. The Council had before them the bringing in of Mr. McDougall with a large force, but several members having said that the people would not go for that purpose, as the Canadian Government should be prepared to protect their Governor themselves. Nothing came of the discussion. Two of the French members of the Council were appointed to go among the French people, and endeavor to get them to allow Mr. McDougall to come into the territory. They went to where the French party were assembled, but on the following day we heard that, notwithstanding this, the French party had gone up armed, and as both of the French parties were very much excited, a serious outbreak between them was feared. Governor McTavish then recalled the Order of the Council, directing them to go up unarmed. About this time we first heard that the Rev. Mr. Ritchot was the prime mover in the French party. On hearing this, Governor McTavish wrote to him, invoking his aid to restore order and quiet the people. This letter is in the Governor's letter book. After this letter was written, Father Ritchot came to Governor McTavish, and spent some hours with him in warm discussion of the matter. I was not present, but Mr. McTavish informed me of it, and said that he was under the impression as the result of the interview that Father Ritchot would assist in restoring order. We afterwards heard that Father Ritchot went to the meeting of the French party, and informed them that Governor McTavish coincided with them. He told them not to give way. The Council of Assiniboia met again on the 30th, and approved of the letter from Governor McTavish to Mr. McDougall, which is in the Blue Book, and it was forwarded to Mr. McDougall. On the 3rd November the French party took possession of Fort Garry. In the afternoon I saw about twenty armed men apparently leaving from the inside the back gate of the Fort, which was always kept locked. This was the entrance from the Governor's premises, which were usually kept private. I spoke to them, enquiring of them what they were doing there, and they said they were ordered to guard that gate by their superiors, and that Riel was in the Fort wanting to see me. I saw him, and he told me he was very sorry that it was forced upon him to come into Fort Garry, that they respected the Company's property, and that nothing would be touched, and no one would be injured, and that they would not remain longer than two or three days. I told him to withdraw his men immediately, and he said he was very sorry he could not do that. He said he had 120 men. I had about fifteen including the Governor. I told him he had taken forcible possession, and he would be responsible for it. Riel wished to see the Governor, but he was too ill. He, however, sent him a message by me to withdraw at once from the Fort. Governor McTavish and I had before this considered the possibility of defending the Fort, and we had decided we could not get a sufficient force to do so, those who were best affected to the Company being then in insurrection. Riel had told me that he and his party were there to protect the Fort, as they knew the circumstances of the country. After that, the Provisional Government was formed, and Riel became President. I am not aware of any sufficient causes for these disturbances or outbreaks. There were prettexts put forward, but there was no real ground.

Know of no causes for the retarding of the amnesty, or of any subsequent promise of an amnesty. There was a mass meeting of the people in January. At the meeting there was a great deal of excitement about the non-production of some papers brought into the settlement by the Rev. Mr. Thibault and Col. De Salaberry, which were taken by Riel's people. After some discussion these papers were produced. My impression is, that the proclamation was read. At any rate the substance of it was distinctly stated, and I remember the part of it particularly about laying down their arms. The French party, however, did not then lay down their arms, but continued in arms until Colonel Wolseley's arrival.

WILLIAM COWAN.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
8th May, 1874.

Honorable Joseph Royal examined:—

I am a member of the Provincial Cabinet of Manitoba. I arrived in the Northwest in August, 1870.

I returned to Montreal in the latter end of September, 1870. Sir George Cartier telegraphed to me enquiring whether I intended to return to Manitoba, as I had only gone there on a visit in the first instance.

I had been his chief law clerk.

I met him at Montreal. Having ascertained that I intended to return, he spoke to me on various subjects connected with the Province. One of the first points he referred to was the amnesty. I had found while at Manitoba a general expectation that the amnesty would daily arrive. I had been present at an informal meeting of Riel's Council on the eve of the arrival of the troops, when the subject of presenting an address to Governor Archibald was discussed, they then expecting that he would arrive a day or two in advance of the troops.

In the interview referred to I said to Sir George, I intend to go to Manitoba if the amnesty is to be proclaimed.

He advised me very strongly to go, for several reasons. He enquired if I had seen Riel. He told me to tell Riel, and write to him, "*L'amnestie est une affaire décidée, c'est une affaire faite.*" He stated that it was a settled affair; "that the thing was done."

He expressly asked me to inform Riel of this, and to write to him if I could not see him.

He added, "tell Riel, also, to go away from the country for five or six years, so as to let the excitement pass away." He mentioned no condition as annexed to the amnesty. He thought Riel had better leave in order to prevent the excitement which he thought might continue if Riel remained. The proclamation of the amnesty was not to be delayed for the five or six years or for any time. I did not ask him what would be the object of granting the amnesty if Riel was to leave the country. I had myself the idea that it would be better for Riel to keep away for a few months at any rate; while the troops were there for instance. I saw no other Member of the Government on this occasion.

I returned to Manitoba in the month of November, 1870, Riel being then at St. Joseph of Pembina. I wrote to him the effect of the conversation between Sir George Cartier and myself.

He merely acknowledged the receipt of my letter, and complained that they were taking their time to fulfil their promise. He said nothing about his absence from the country. He remained away during the December elections. I have frequently seen Riel in Manitoba since.

When I returned to Manitoba after my conversation with Sir George I found that the same strong expectation of the early arrival of the amnesty existed.

Sir George said nothing to me, as far as I remember, about difficulties existing between the Imperial and Dominion Governments on the subject of the amnesty in consequence of the death of Scott.

He said nothing about the death of Scott as far as I remember.

Riel remained at St. Joseph of Pembina until June, 1871. As far as I know, or can recollect, he did not make his appearance in the territory at all after his departure until that time. If he had come over even privately I should have known.

I was called in as a member of the Government by Mr. Archibald in March, 1872.

I was Speaker of the House in October, 1871, when the so-called Fenian invasion took place. I acted as intermediary, when the first news of the Fenian invasion came, between the French half-breeds and the authorities. I explained to the former the nature of the Fenian movement and of the invasion. They were ignorant of both, and Governor Archibald thought they were somewhat slow in expressing their loyalty.

The French proclamation about the Fenians was two days later than the English, having been accidentally delayed. I never heard Mr. Riel's name mentioned as having anything to do with the Fenians. Before the raid there were rumors of a large Irish colonization movement being organized in the States.

The population did not know that there was to be any armed invasion. O'Donoghue's name was mentioned in connection with it.

Until the nature of the Fenian raid was explained to the half-breeds by myself and two or three others, they did not appear to be aware that the Fenian movement was a hostile one.

These others were the Rev. Mr. Ritchot, Rev. Mr. Dugas, Mr. Dubuc, and some few others.

The explanations were made about the middle of the week, as soon as it was known that a body of armed men were on the frontier, and by Saturday they had organized a body of men, of part of which I was in command. On Sunday they were met by Governor Archibald, and on Monday morning started for the frontier. On that occasion I know that Riel acted in perfect accord with us, and I saw the letter he wrote to Governor Archibald. That letter was written by Riel, as well on his own behalf as on that of those concerned in the troubles, and it asked in substance, if he and his friends would be protected from arrest or molestation if they should come forward and take an active part in the defence of the territory. Riel was then living five miles south of Fort Garry, and he then assisted us very much in explaining the nature of the Fenian invasion.

If Riel had been playing a double game I would have been in a position to know it, as far as a man can judge of another man's words or acts. I was not present at any Sunday meeting when Delorme made any propositions about the Fenians.

I have been always placed under the impression by Governor Archibald that the amnesty had been granted, and that its promulgation was only a question of time; and when I entered the Cabinet I did so under that impression.

I had many conversations with Governor Archibald about it; in fact the amnesty was a standard subject of conversation between us during the last four years. I cannot recollect the exact words that passed on these occasions, but the impression that the amnesty had been granted was rather conveyed to me by implication than directly asserted by Governor Archibald. I understood there were some technical difficulties at first in obtaining it, and then that the proper opportunity for promulgating it was being awaited. It was never denied till Governor Morris came, that the amnesty had been granted. Governor Morris said that it had not been granted. He was then Chief Justice and Administrator of the Government, and he said to a deputation that he was never made aware of the granting of an amnesty, and that none had been granted while he was a member of the Government here, to his knowledge, or words to that effect.

I had no communication direct with Mr. Dorion on the subject of Mr. Riel's candidature last election, both Governor Morris and Monseigneur Taché told me that the present Dominion Government were very desirous that Mr. Riel should not become a candidate. I understood from both that there had been correspondence between them and Mr. Dorion by telegrams as well as letters about the candidature of Mr. Riel.

JOSEPH ROYAL.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
12th May, 1874.

James Spencer Lynch, of Manitoba, examined :—

I went to Manitoba in June, 1869, and remained until March, 1870.

I consider the chief, if not the sole cause of the troubles was the operation and working in various ways of a conspiracy among the Roman Catholic clergy.

I found my opinion on the fact that these clergy exercise an almost unlimited control over their people in their affairs, and that it was scarcely probable that such a departure from their usual ways should have taken place without the encouragement of their priests. Had any disapproval been shown by the priests at any time the course taken by these people would have been abandoned.

I never was a witness to the exercise of any influence by the priests in this particular matter; but I have heard very many times in the country before the troubles began, and from persons I think credible, that the priests were exciting the people to the course they afterwards took by inflammatory discourses.

As to particular persons, Father Ritchot's name, I remember as having been among those who so spoke. Others were named, but I do not recollect their names, save that of Father Lestanc. I cannot remember the names of any of the persons who told me of their inflammatory discourses. The statements were so frequently repeated that I have lost recollection of particulars.

I was much through the country during the few months preceding the troubles, as well through the French as the English parishes, and I found almost universal satisfaction existing with reference to the proposed change of Government and the acquisition of the country by Canada.

The people generally did not fully comprehend the nature of the change, but whatever it might be they had full confidence in the good faith and good intentions of Canada towards them.

I was travelling through the country as an intending emigrant, desirous to inform myself of what might be useful to me.

Such dissatisfaction as I found existed chiefly among traders who had, under the existing regime, a practical monopoly, and who were hostile to a change which would probably produce competition in their business; and among certain United States citizens resident in the country, whose hopes were for annexation to the United States; and among certain hangers-on of the Hudson's Bay Company, who imagined the Company to be not in accord with the Canadian Government, and who acted as they thought would please the Company.

The influence of any one class of these three classes of discontented persons was very slight, but the language they constantly used to the half-breeds was, subject to the other cause I have already mentioned, successful in creating doubt and distrust in the minds of the half-breeds.

Thus these persons were made to appear as the real agents in the troubles, though but for the first cause I have mentioned, I believe their efforts would have been quite futile.

The course of conversation pursued by these traders and others was to remind the half-breeds that they had been a very happy people, but that all was to be changed, and that they were to be set aside to make room for strangers and foreigners.

I have heard this sort of talk. They were more innuendoes than plain statements.

The people did not consider and were not aware that they had grievances till they were educated to it by the means I have above described.

Considerable feeling was aroused among the people by the acts said to have been committed by Canadians in the country. For example, it was said that individual Canadians were taking up vast tracts of lands; were disrespectful to the natives of the country; used reckless language as to the change that would ensue on the arrival of Governor McDougall; and that some or all of them who held official positions dealt dishonestly with the natives.

These statements were pretty widely circulated, and pretty generally believed among the Metis.

I have been told that Father Ritchot has made such statements in church, and also other priests; and as a rule the other classes to whom I have referred, believe these statements of the priests, from whom they seem to take their cue, and circulated the same statements.

My own observations led me to believe that these reports were not altogether unfounded but were largely exaggerated.

There were a few reckless persons among the Canadians there who used foolish expressions, but this number were very few indeed. I do not believe there were half-a-dozen such persons, but their improper language was laid on the shoulders of the whole body.

I am confident that in the majority of cases the reports of dishonest dealings were entirely without foundation, but I believe that in some few cases there was foundation for the reports, though even in these cases the gravity of the offence was much exaggerated.

I have, however, no personal knowledge which would enable me positively to affirm or disaffirm these reports.

I have always held to the opinion that the conspiracy which I have mentioned as the chief cause was not confined to Manitoba, but that suggestions were made from time to time by persons in the other Provinces who acquired knowledge of the proceedings of the Government here, and, from time to time, informed the conspirators how far it would be safe for them to go.

My first reason for so believing is, that these persons would not have dared to go to the extent they did without some assurance on which they could rely that they would be protected or that their offences would be condoned.

Again, their conduct from time to time bore evidence of advice given from time to time; a certain course was pursued for a period, and then, without reason apparent on the spot, it was entirely abandoned for a different course.

It can scarcely be a coincidence that these persons framed a "Bill of Rights" which was just what the Government was prepared to grant them.

I cannot think, at present, of any other reasons for my opinion. I had no personal knowledge of the intervention of persons in the other Provinces.

I think the position of the Hudson's Bay Company, as to the troubles, was that of a third or neutral party. They did not take sides.

I have reason to believe there were some individuals in the service of the Company who sympathized with the insurgents, but that such persons did not in this represent the feelings of the Company as a whole.

I believe the Company's government might have done much to arrest the course taken by the insurgents had they called in the assistance of the loyal portion of the community, English and French; but as they did not do this they were unable to repress the affair of themselves.

Their course throughout in the main was a passive one. I do not believe they had anything to do with the origin of the affair; however much some of their servants may have sympathized with it later.

I have no knowledge of the causes which led to the withholding of the amnesty promised in the proclamation of the 6th December, further than the fact that the murder of Scott was subsequent to the issue of that proclamation, and that event, I suppose, was the cause of the provisions of that proclamation not being carried into effect.

I do not know of any promises having been made of an amnesty subsequent to the proclamation of the 6th December, either by D. A. Smith or any other person.

J. S. LYNCH.