Errand, Mission, Expedition

The use of force in annexing Rupert's Land was in the air in Canada as early as September of 1869, and in the following months volunteers for action in the North-West were not slow in coming forward. The Canadian government considered arming with rifles either a police force or a volunteer force of some kind. Preparations for shipping these rifles were made before either the stopping of the surveys by the Métis or the preventing of McDougall's entry into Rupert's Land. While it could be argued that these rifles were intended for the use of a mounted police force, and that the fears of the Métis were aroused unnecessarily, the same cannot be said for the letting of contracts for the building of boats to transport an expedition.[1] This had been discussed in November of 1869, and the order-in-council appropriating money to purchase the boats was passed in January of 1870.[2]

It is clear, then, that sending an expeditionary force was Canadian government policy before the two deaths of the February counter-movement or the execution of Scott in March.

A Cabinet committee set up to study the Red River situation reported to the full Cabinet on February 11, 1870, and requested the Governor General to ask the British government to send an expeditionary force to Red River in cooperation with the Canadian government:

> It is obvious that the Expedition must be undertaken, organized, commanded and carried through under the authority of Her Majesty's Government. Canada has no authority beyond her own limits and no power whatever to send a Volunteer Force or to order her Militia on this, to her, a foreign service.[3]

The Minute acknowledged that a public meeting had been held at Red River. Letters given to Thibault, de Salaberry and Smith were read, and arrangements made "for a conference of delegates to be elected by the people". The result of the conference was not yet known. The Minute also acknowledged that the government of Mr. Mactavish was "merely nominal" and

"completely at the mercy of the disaffected classes". The Minute expressed the fear that the insurgent leaders would insist upon demands made in the Manifesto or Declaration of Rights, "several of which are altogether inadmissable". The Minute did not specify which demands were inadmissible. However, it expressed the fear that, should the delegates insist on the "inadmissable" demands, they might return to Fort Garry "smarting under the sense of failure", and, "unless confronted by a Military Force and a strengthened Government, make violent appeals to the people and raise a second insurrection on a more formidable basis". It would appear that British Colonial Office fears about the appearance of coercion had a basis in fact.

According to the Minute there were, in addition, much more important reasons for sending a force to Red River. The "insurgent leaders", the Minute continued, had "already declared themselves in favor of annexation to the United States," and their good faith concerning the sending of delegates to Canada was to be doubted. Senator Ramsay of Minnesota had already brought the Red River affair to the attention of Congress. There was a widespread feeling in Rupert's Land and in the United States that Britain was no longer interested in her North American colonies. An expeditionary force would dispel this feeling, wherever it existed.

The importance of an early start in the spring was emphasized, to allow the expedition to reach Red River before materials could be taken into the Settlement over roads across the prairies. "Should by any unfortunate delay or accident the Expedition be postponed until the summer the insurgents would doubtless receive large and continuous aid and comfort from the American people".

Contracts, the Minute reminded its readers, had already been entered into for the construction of the boats required, and no time should be lost "in settling the number and

description of the Force, the officer to be entrusted with the command, and in the preparation of the material and transport service".

The Committee felt that the Hudson's Bay Company, Canada and Her Majesty's Government should each contribute "towards the restoration of the Queen's authority in Rupert's Land. By the action of the insurgents that authority had been set at nought, the policy of England thwarted and her power defied".

The Governor General was requested to transmit a copy of the Minute to Earl Granville "in order that he may move Her Majesty's Government to take the matter in consideration for the purpose of immediate action". A copy was to be sent to Sir John Rose, too, to assist him in case he should be called upon to act in negotiations between Canada and the Hudson's Bay Company.

The British government acted upon the request with some reluctance. There was concern that it might appear that the inhabitants of the Red River Settlement were being coerced into Confederation. A considerable correspondence ensued between Sir John Young and Granville, and between Sir John Young and Sir John A. Macdonald. To Sir John Young's astonishment, the Colonial Office was worried about the rights of Roman Catholics in the Settlement. As for Sir Clinton Murdoch, he was not helping matters by doubting whether his instructions gave him the power to assist in such an important decision.[4] On April 10 Macdonald expressed his impatience in a note to Young:

> The difficulty that I feel is this. Lord Granville says in his tel that if we accept the country, England will send her troops, but in his instructions to Sir Clinton Murdoch he says the troops are not to be used to force the people to unite with Canada, - in other words TO BE OF NO USE [emphasis mine]. Now if we accept the country we are committed to its CONQUEST [emphasis mine] and must go on. We can't return the country to Her Majesty or the H [udson's] B [ay] Company again[. W] hy should we agree to pay for troops that may be ordered not to act when they get to Fort Garry?

Having stated the nature of the difficulty Macdonald thought he was in a position to suggest a way out of it:

> My idea is that Sir C. Murdoch should convince himself that the majority of the people desire union with Canada and then procure a pledge from England by cable that the troops will be sent and used, if necessary when sent.[5]

Macdonald did not specify how Murdoch was to "convince himself" of the Red River people's desires, and we are left to conjecture about that. However, he evidently came to see matters in that light, and the consent of the Colonial Office was secured.[6] It must be observed here, by the way, that Macdonald's remarks indicate clearly the light in which he saw the Red River Expeditionary Force. It must also be observed that it was the British government – and not the Canadian – which was concerned about the welfare of those who were to become Canadian citizens in the following months.

Sir John Young must have had to do mental gymnastics as he read the speech closing Parliament on May 12 of 1870:

> The Military Expedition which it is necessary to send will gratify and give confidence to all loyal and well-disposed persons. Her Majesty's troops go forth on an errand of peace, and will serve as an assurance to the inhabitants of the Red River Settlement…that they have a place in the regard and counsels of England, and may rely upon the imperial protection of the British sceptre.[7]

While the Colonial Office had been testing Sir John Young's patience the decision as to who was to lead it was giving concern to the government. Col. G.T. Denison's well-orchestrated campaign, given impetus by the members of "Canada First" and recorded by Denison in The Struggle For Imperial Unity, brought forward the name of Col. Garnet Wolseley with such vigor that he was chosen for the command.[8]

Wolseley had had considerable military experience, having served in the second Burmese war, and in the Crimean war, where he lost the sight of an eye. He served in India at the time of the Mutiny, and in the China war in 1860. In December of 1861, at the time of the "Trent" affair, he was sent to Canada, and stayed to spend his time reading military history and preparing a manual for soldiers. Like Denison, he favored the Confederate side in the American Civil War,[9] and in September of 1862 took time off to travel to northern Virginia to meet General Robert E. Lee not long after the battle of Antietam.[10] There is no record of his making a similar trip to Union commanders. However, his Irish Protestant background and upbringing made him prone to come under the influence of such men as Denison, for whom to be French-speaking and Catholic was to be guilty of treason. Denison saw the Red River Expeditionary Force as necessary punishment for the Métis "rebels", and was not reticent about it.[11] Denison was with Wolseley both before and after his appointment as commanding officer.[12] In February of 1870 he was at Wolseley's house for a week discussing with him information which Denison had collected about the terrain and history of the area through which the Force would have to pass. He was with Wolseley, it must be noted, when the Cabinet prepared its memorandum of February 11 recommending an expedition to Red River.[13] Denison was in Ottawa again for some time in April, and was in Wolseley's office "a good deal".[14] When the Force was mobilized in Toronto Wolseley tried to persuade Denison to go with him, but Denison would not hear of it, saying that he was certain he would be needed in Ontario:

> I told him all his troubles would be in the rear, and that some bold man would be required in Toronto to fight the battle there.[15]

The "battle" to which Denison referred had to do with the reasons for the Force itself. Once the negotiations with the Red River delegates were completed and the Manitoba Act passed by Parliament, much of Canadian public opinion could see little reason to send a military

expedition to Red River, and, of course, the situation there required no expedition. The Provisional Government was widely accepted and was prepared to meet the Lieutenant-governor-designate with open arms and make way for the establishment of a provincial government under the Manitoba Act. Indeed, it is to be regretted that things did not turn out that way. In Britain, too, there were those who could see that a military expedition could do more harm than good and might, in fact, do harm to the long-term Canadian interest.[16] These were far-sighted people.

Denison and "Canada First", whose policy was punitive, were worried that something would occur to make the recall of the Force appear desirable, and Denison was determined not to leave the East, where decisions were made. It must be remembered that Sir John A. Macdonald became seriously ill during the negotiations with the Red River delegates, and from then on Denison's enemy, Cartier, was serving as the head of government. As Denison saw it, the "French-Canadian party" was in charge, and he didn't trust it. It is interesting to note, and it cannot be coincidental, that there is in Wolseley's instructions a "15A", which reads as follows:

> During your advance from Toronto you will take no orders from any one except me and I shall not interfere with your arrangements relying on and having the greatest confidence in your discretion.[17]

As it turned out, the only time when the recall of the Force was seriously considered came about as a result of Wolseley's own misjudgment. Explanation is needed here. Students of the Force are familiar with Wolseley's statement that the road from Thunder Bay to Shebandowan lake had not been completed and was not ready for him to move boats over it. Wolseley told how he sized up the situation and decided that, although he had been told that the Kaministiquia river could not be used, "owing to the dangerous nature of its rapids and the magnitude of its falls", he nevertheless set men to work dragging forward the boats along the

rocky channel of the river.[18] The disadvantage of this procedure was that the boats took considerable damage from the rocks over which they were moved and, upon arrival, had to be repaired before they could be used.[19] Also, it was found that, since inexperienced men could not move the boats forward in this way, voyageurs had to be diverted from road work and employed in conveying boats up the rocky channel of the river.[20]

Wolseley did not tell his readers that this distasteful work resulted in the desertion of the Indians brought at great expense from Nipigon and the Grand Portage, and that the Fort William Indians deserted after a trip or two. Wolseley also did not mention that voyageurs began to ask him,

> Why do you keep us dragging boats over rocks where there is no water to float them, when a single wagon would accomplish more in a day that we can in ten? By using wagons you would have your boats in good order: whereas, by exposing them to such usage as this they are rendered unfit for the long journey yet before us.[21]

S.J. Dawson's complete report can be found in the pages of Volunteer Review. The more readily available, but abridged, version does not have the record of this incident. Dawson told how he remonstrated with Wolseley, but Wolseley was adamant, so Dawson simply made the best of the situation. However, with many desertions, with road builders being used to carry boats, with supplies beginning to pile up at certain locations and remaining there, and with damaged boats having to be repaired, it began to be realized that the Force could not go through in time and morale fell badly. Reports were sent to the East, and in late June and in July newspapers began to carry the rumor that the Expedition was to be abandoned.[22] Luckily for it Lindsay, the Lieutenant-General commanding, visited the area, going as far forward as Shebandowan lake, and listening and observing as he went. Dawson outlined in his report what was necessary and what Lindsay ordered:

> In this position the true plan [was] to set all the available force, both soldiers and voyageurs, to work on the unfinished section of the road, so as to have it completed by the time the boats should reach the Matawin bridge.[23]

There was only one person who could give Wolseley orders which he must obey, and that person had to appear on the scene and give orders before the Expeditionary Force could advance in time to return as planned. With a change of orders good men could do good work.

On June 30, before leaving Prince Arthur's landing, Wolseley had another road on his mind. He sent a proclamation to the Red River Settlement, reminding the people there that his was a mission of peace, and calling upon all loyal and well-disposed people to help him in carrying it out. Not wishing to appear to recognize the Provisional Government, he sent copies to the Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops and to the governor of the Hudson's Bay Company at Fort Garry. These people were requested by letter to take measures toward pushing on the work on the road to Lake of the Woods, a road which was already partially made. The same people took the sensible step of notifying the Provisional Government of Wolseley's wishes. Action was promptly taken and work on that road went forward more quickly with the help of larger crews of men.[24] In later months Wolseley was careful to explain to posterity that he considered this a ruse:

> It was never anticipated that this road could be completed in time for us to use it, even should there be no hostilities; but it was considered advisable to impress Riel with the idea that we intended advancing by that route, so that, in case he was bent upon fighting, he would frame all his calculations upon a wrong basis, and make his preparations along it for our reception.[25]

In the meantime, back in Toronto, Denison was working to ensure that a conspiracy of some kind did not succeed in recalling the Force. So certain was he that someone wished to recall it that he had

> written to Colonel Wolseley and warned him of the danger, and urged him to push on, and not encourage any messages from the rear. Letters were written to officers on the expedition to impede and delay any messengers who might be sent up, and in case the troops were ordered home, the idea was conveyed to the Ontario men to let the regulars go back, but for them to take their boats and provisions and go on at all hazards.[26]

Denison later admitted that letters written by him may have served to delay the progress of Mr. Archibald, the Lieutenant-governor-designate, to his new post in Manitoba.[27]

One of the most remarkable episodes in the history of Toronto was soon to unfold, showing the lengths to which the members of "Canada First" were prepared to go as their religious fears and bigotry led them to see a Jesuitical plot in every move the government made.

Bishop Taché left Red River on June 28, having in mind to press for the issuing of a general amnesty so that the transfer to Canadian rule in the North-West might be peacefully accomplished.[28] Taché reached Ottawa about July 11 or 12.[29] Cartier was in Montreal, and Macdonald was ill and could not attend to business. Taché went to Montreal, where he had "many interviews" with Cartier.[30] Cartier confirmed what Ritchot had reported about the negotiations and about the amnesty, and Taché was shown copies of letters which were then on their way to him in Red River. In one of these Howe had notified him that the amnesty which he had promised to the people rested on his own responsibility, since the question of amnesty rested not with the Canadian government but with the Queen. "It would have been better," Howe wrote, "that the amnesty question should not have been discussed, but that it should have been left to be settled between the Queen and the people of Red River".[31] Taché was dismayed and shocked as he read the words, but he fought for self-control. He had never felt more helpless in his life, but somehow found the strength to keep trying. Sir George said that there was nothing more to be done but wait for the amnesty. "We are waiting for the proclamation every day," he

said, "and if you remain for a few weeks it will arrive before you leave."[32] Cartier was speaking what he believed to be the truth. He had every reason to believe that such was the case.

Cartier could see that Taché was not satisfied with these words and insisted that Taché go with him to Niagara to see the Governor General. "You will see the Governor General," he said, "and he will give you the same assurance." Taché did not wish to do this. Niagara was a long way away, and he had other business to do, but Sir George insisted. Cartier told Taché to be in Ottawa the next Monday, and on the Tuesday they would proceed to Niagara along with Mr. Archibald, who was to be sworn in there. Taché did as he was told and went to Ottawa, but Sir George said he was not ready: they would leave on Wednesday instead. In the meantime word of Cartier's assurances to Taché had somehow leaked out, and accounts appeared in the press. Cartier and Taché took the boat at Prescott, and when they arrived at Kingston telegrams were handed to Cartier stating that there was a great excitement in Toronto, and that people were preparing to insult Cartier because he was travelling with the "traitor" Taché.[33]

On July 18 Robert J. Haliburton, a member of "Canada First", by chance saw Sir John Young at Niagara, and in conversation with him learned that Archibald, Cartier and Taché were to meet him there in a few days.[34] Haliburton immediately suspected a plot, of course, and telegraphed a warning to John C. Schultz, then in London, Ontario, and Schultz in turn sent word to Denison. Denison called a meeting of the "committee" for July 19, and arranged at once for a public meeting to be held on July 22 in Toronto. The newspaper Leader for July 19 had a despatch from Ottawa dated July 18 in these words:

> Bishop Taché will arrive here this evening from Montreal. The Privy Council held a special meeting on Saturday. It is stated on good authority that Sir George Cartier will proceed with Lieutenant-Governor Archibald to Niagara Falls next Wednesday to induce His Excellency to go to the North-West via Pembina with L.-G. Archibald and Bishop Taché. On their arrival, Riel is to

> deliver up the Government to them, and the expedition troops will be withdrawn.[35]

The Leader pointed out that it had no knowledge that there was an intention to recall the Expedition, but would not be surprised if the physical difficulties then being encountered by it would make that decision sensible. The Leader saw much merit in the idea that Sir John Young should go to the North-West with Archibald, and "assume the reins of government on behalf of the Queen", see it passed over properly to Mr. Archibald and establish a local force there.[36]

Denison had already written to Wolseley, warning him of "the danger" and urging him to push on. Letters had gone to officers asking them to impede and delay any messengers who might be sent up.[37] Now Denison and the committee swung into action in Toronto. A hostile demonstration was planned, and arrangements were made to burn Cartier's effigy at the station when Cartier and Taché arrived. News of this leaked out, and Lieut.-Col. Durie, district adjutant-general commanding in Toronto, tried to arrange for a guard of honor to protect Cartier, who was, after all, minister of militia. Lieut.-Col. Boxall of the 10th Royal Regiment, when spoken to on the subject, said he had a previous engagement for that evening near the station, the nature of which would make it impossible for him to appear in uniform. Denison was told about this and went to see Durie. As Denison later told the story, he informed Durie that he had "heard of the guard of honor business", and asked him if he thought the guard of honor would intimidate Denison's committee. Denison then told him that if they heard any more of it they "would take possession of the armoury that night, and that we would have ten men to his one, and if anyone in Toronto wanted to fight it out, we were ready to fight it out on the streets".[38] Durie told Denison he was threatening revolution. Denison said, "Yes, I know I am, and we can make it one. A half continent is at stake, and it is a stake worth fighting for".[39]

Durie telegraphed to Cartier not to come to Toronto by railway. Cartier and Taché got off the train at Kingston. Taché went to Niagara by way of the United States, while Cartier took the steamer for Toronto, arrived at the wharf in the morning, transferred to the Niagara boat and crossed to Niagara Falls. Denison and committee, meanwhile, planned a huge demonstration for July 22, the purpose of which was to protest against any planned withdrawal of the Expedition, to urge the punishment of the "rebels" and protest against the granting of any kind of amnesty, and, in case of the withdrawal of the Expedition, to organize an "armed emigration" to the Red River Settlement.[40]

In view of the nature of Denison's threat to Durie we must now take a closer look at this "loyalist" and descendant of Loyalists, who would threaten revolution when it suited him. How was it possible for him to make such a threat and be taken seriously? Who would take possession of the armoury that night? How could he and his committee have "ten men to Durie's one" and "fight it out on the streets"? Here we must look again at the "Young Britons".

Violence was a disease in Toronto and in much of Ontario in the 1870s. Its roots lay in the Irish problem and in the thousands of Irish immigrants who had brought it to Canada with them. Newspapers of the time published police court accounts mentioning "rampant rowdyism", the "Young Britons" and "Orange and Green riots".[41] The spring and summer of 1870 was worse than usual, and the Telegraph for October 31 complained about the series of street rows involving the "Young Britons" and the "Young Irish". The Globe, for its part, was ready to name names, and named Captain James Bennett, District Master of the city Orange Lodges.[42]

The disturbances had become more noticeable with the great meeting of April 6, which was attended by one thousand people. This attendance was by no means spontaneous, but had been carefully organized by Captain James Bennett. Bennett was a member of the "Canada First"

group.[43] At that meeting Bennett had produced "the rope", about a yard long, with which, it was alleged, Scott's hands had been tied at the time of his execution.[44] In his address to the meeting Bennett spoke of the troubles at Red River as being simply Roman Catholicism versus Protestantism.

Denison knew that through Bennett and his connections in the city he could easily muster enough young men to outnumber the guard of honor Durie was planning.[45] Durie backed down, and that confrontation never took place, but Denison and his committee went to work anyway to plan a mass demonstration. Soon placards advertising the meeting appeared: "Orangemen! Is Brother Scott forgotten already?"; "Men of Ontario! Shall Scott's blood cry in vain for vengeance?"[46] Naturally such a gathering could not be arranged without arousing the feelings of the "Young Irish" and fracases not planned by Bennett took place. If the demonstration had its effect on the peace of the city of Toronto it also had an immediate effect on the government of Canada. Bishop Taché's deposition before the Select Committee of 1874 illustrates the point:

> On Saturday morning I left Buffalo and went to Niagara...Sir George looked very uneasy. He told me indignation meetings had taken place in Toronto, and had given His Excellency a good deal of uneasiness....[47]

There was some doubt now whether the scheduled meeting would take place. Taché offered to leave, saying that he had not wanted to come in the first place. However, Sir George spoke to Young again and came back to Taché saying that Young would now receive him. On going to Young's room Taché found him standing near the door. Before Taché could greet him he said, "I suppose you did not come here to talk about politics?" Taché replied, "I am satisfied that you are aware of the nature of my journey. I started from Montreal, not according to my own wishes, but at the request of your own Minister. I suppose Sir George told you what I came about?" Young said, "There is a great deal of trouble connected with these matters, and I do not like to

speak about them." Taché said that in that case he was willing to withdraw. Young then showed Taché a chair, and began to talk about Red River affairs. When Taché drew Young's attention to the question of an amnesty he pointed to his proclamation of December 6, 1869, and said, "Here is my proclamation; it covers the whole case". Then he said, "See Sir George Cartier; he knows my view upon the subject, and he will tell you all". As Taché turned to go Young asked him to put into writing some of the remarks Taché had made to him. Taché said that he would do so, and the interview was at an end.

One cannot contemplate this discussion between the two men without much frustration, sadness and compassion. Both men well knew that the proclamation of December 6, 1869, did not cover the whole case. Events had occurred after that date which markedly altered the nature of it. The Governor General had taken decisions against the issuing of an amnesty. He was now having to stall for time as the Red River Expeditionary Force made its way to the new province. The Bishop, for his part, knew that he was in a tight spot and that there was no getting out of it. If he did not send some kind of reassurance concerning an amnesty to those at Red River the pressure on Riel to allow the people to resist might become overwhelming, and there could be a slaughter somewhere along the western end of the old voyageurs' route. Red River would then almost inevitably become part of the American Union. On the other hand, if he did give reassurance of an amnesty he might be guilty of lying to his people. And yet – that way there might still be a chance for him to work to obtain an amnesty, if not from this present government then possibly from a successor. He would try.

Taché then took the decision which caused him anguish all the rest of his life. He and Cartier set to work to prepare a telegram leading Red River people to believe "that the promise that had been made had not changed". The telegram was addressed to Father Lestanc.[48]

The indignation meeting had taken place in Toronto on July 22. The interview with Sir John Young was held on July 23. That day Taché left Niagara and stayed at Hamilton. That same day he wrote the letter that Young had requested. He realized that it was probably his last chance to present his arguments to anyone in the government, and he chose his words with care.

He pointed out that three men had lost their lives at Red River, while the Ontario press seemed to pay attention only to the death of the "unfortunate Thomas Scott". He said that his promise of an amnesty had contributed very largely to the peaceful state which then existed at Red River. He had considered that he was doing the right thing when he remembered the facts which had been communicated to him when he was on his way back to Red River from the Council at the Vatican, when he remembered the tone of Sir John A. Macdonald's letter of February 16, 1870, and when he remembered the fact that His Excellency had issued a proclamation in December of 1869. He thought that an act of clemency was not too much "when the peace of a country is at stake". He stated frankly that if an amnesty was not granted he would "be considered by some as having imposed upon the people, and would only have prepared a fearful reaction". Others, who would never doubt his sincerity, would easily believe that he had been deceived by the Canadian government.

Taché concluded by making a rather telling observation about the conduct of public affairs in Canada:

> If an 'indignation meeting' called by the 'loyal inhabitants' of Toronto is sufficient to give a direction to the settlement of affairs at Red River, every one will easily admit that it is impossible for us to expect liberal measures, or even the most elementary justice. I easily understand the pressure brought upon the authorities at Ottawa by such demonstrations, inspired by party spirit, rather than by 'horror of crime', but I appeal to the tribune of our Gracious Sovereign....[49]

Taché may not have realized at that moment how accurately he had analyzed the situation. There is little indication that either Taché's remarks or his letter putting those remarks into "writing" had any influence on the Governor General. Then as earlier that gentleman was listening to a different constituency. On August 6 Young wrote to Sir John A. Macdonald giving an account of what had been decided about Archibald's trip to Manitoba:

> I was quite against his going through the United States to his destination, even in the best of company – Indeed the Paeans in the papers which announced that he was to do so, that an amnesty had been granted, that the expedition was to be stayed on its way – and a visit paid me here by Sir G[eorge] C[artier], Bishop Taché and Archibald to announce all these 'faits accomplis' gave me for a week a very bad gastralgia...However things went off better and more quietly than I expected – None of the events I apprehended came to pass – and though Taché was evidently chagrined, Cartier seemed all right and Archibald was well pleased. Now I hope Riel & Co will run away and give the U[nited] States the permanent aid of their virtue and ability.[50]

Meanwhile, on August 9 Wolseley was at Fort Frances, and would leave that place on August 10. He had arrived there on August 4, and proceeded to make arrangements both for the guiding of the brigades across Lake of the Woods and for the movement of troops down the Winnipeg river. On August 4 at Rainy lake, he had met Butler, then "twelve days out" from Fort Garry, with news from that place to July 24, and of his conversation with Riel.[51] August 5 saw the arrival of Monkman, the English Half-breed who had assisted John C. Schultz in his long winter traverse of the country from the Lower Settlement to St. Paul the preceding winter. Monkman had met Wolseley at Prince Arthur's Landing in June and had agreed to go to the Settlement and return with news. Monkman informed Wolseley that six large Hudson's Bay boats had been sent up the Winnipeg river by Mr. Boyd and the party of Canadians, accompanied by the Rev. J.P. Gardiner.[52]

These reports showed conclusively that no effort was being made, or would be made, to prevent the Expedition from navigating the Winnipeg river. And so Wolseley's trip down that river was something like travel down a modern highway. Every portage had a name dating from the days when it was the main waterway from Montreal to the North-West. Wolseley knew from his studies in February what everyone who travelled the route came to know: the Winnipeg river was where the Force would have met resistance if there was to be resistance. The inexperienced Volunteers might crack jokes about how they would deal with Riel if he "meant fight"; Wolseley was under no such illusion. The correspondent of the Telegraph, at a pause on a portage on August 14, marvelled at the number of excellent places to ambush an expedition such as the one he was with:

> ...I am convinced that it has been well for us that our mission was a 'mission of peace'. For I am of opinion – and almost every officer in the detachment agrees with me – that a hundred determined men with a couple of guns, could not only have, over and over again, sent our boats to the bottom, but have kept the whole detachment at bay, and in fact have caused its return....[53]

At Fort Alexander the Force found Donald A. Smith waiting to accompany it to Fort Garry.[54] And, while he is not mentioned by any of the official sources, James G. Stewart also joined the Expedition, either at Fort Alexander or as the Expedition made its way through the Lower Settlement. He was on furlough from service with the Hudson's Bay Company.[55]

There is something symbolic in the way these two men approached Fort Garry. Smith, of course, was in Wolseley's party, and would be asked by him to assume civilian authority pending the arrival of the Lieutenant-governor-designate. As for Stewart, he seems to have been able to appear to join the Expedition. Then at a certain moment he was able to elude its advance guard, and rode into Fort Garry in time to warn Riel that his life was in danger. Riel replied to the effect that the Expedition was supposed to be a peaceful one, whereupon Stewart answered,

"As a friend I advise you to get out immediately."[56] Stewart's action gives support to the view that among the Company's lower echelons there was anger with recent Company policy and support for the Provisional Government.

As the Expeditionary Force advanced through the rain towards Fort Garry its behavior hardly resembled that of a "mission of peace". People of the Lower Settlement who had made their way by design or accident within its lines were taken prisoner.[57] The Force did not pause to send emissaries forward to make contact with the Provisional Government. Instead, every effort was made to conceal its approach. Couriers sent out by Riel were arrested and detained.[58] As it moved closer to Winnipeg it threw out skirmishers, limbered up guns behind a couple of country carts, formed a company into a rear-guard, and passed around the flank of that village. Wolseley sent forward some of his staff to see if any gates were open.[59] Hayshe says that the troops marched in by the Assiniboine gate, but one participant later told of battering down a gate and rushing in over the fallen timbers, "expecting a hand-to-hand conflict".[60] In their over-enthusiasm some of the men began to loot the stores of the Hudson's Bay Company.[61] Others looted the house Riel had used as headquarters.[62] Still others threw precious documents into a well.[63] Three of the Provisional Government councillors – men who could have spoken for the regime just ending – were placed under arrest, as was Mr. Champagne, whose crime was that of being present in the Fort.[64]

Since the civil disruption caused by such unusual behavior had results which lasted throughout and beyond the Archibald administration, we have to ask how we can explain it. Certainly the explanation is not to be found in Wolseley's official instructions. As we have seen, the officials of the Colonial Office, mindful of centuries of British experience in the control of military forces by the civil authorities, had warned against the sending of such an Expedition at

all. There is, of course, no doubt that the circles in which Garnet Wolseley had moved in the East had seen the Expedition as punitive, but how did he dare to make policy of such an attitude? It is likely that the answer is to be found in numerous unofficial conversations and assumptions which enabled Sir John Young to write as follows to Sir John A. Macdonald on August 6:

> I have told General Lindsay who will instruct Wolseley that the Canadian Gov't has never recognized Riel's Provisional Government but only the Delegates as appointed by the general convention of the people before poor Scott's life was taken.[65]

Wolseley must have been pleased to receive this unwritten instruction passed on to him from the Queen's representative in Canada. For Garnet Wolseley it was a declaration of war on the Provisional Government.

---

[1] See chapter, "The Rifles".
[2] Construction of the boats was public knowledge by April, 1870. See PAM MG3 B9 Vicar Papers, McVicar to Polson, April 3, 1870.
[3] PAC Macdonald Papers, Vol. 101, Minute of Council, Feb. 11, 1870.
[4] PAC Macdonald Papers, Vol. 101, Young to Macdonald, April 11, 1870.
[5] PAC Macdonald Papers, Vol. 101, Macdonald to Young, April 10, 1870.
[6] PAC Macdonald Papers, Vol. 101, Granville to Young, received in Ottawa, April 23, 1870.
[7] Canada, Senate, Debates, May 23, 1870, 236.
[8] Denison, The Struggle For Imperial Unity (afterwards Struggle), 33; Denison, Soldiering in Canada (afterwards Soldiering), 174.
[9] Denison, Soldiering, 58-82.
[10] James A. Hawley, The American Civil War: An English View, ciii.
[11] Denison, Struggle, 34, 44; Denison, Soldiering, 175, 178; An Officer of the Expeditionary Force, "Narrative of the Red River Expedition: in Blackwood's Magazine, Dec. 1870, Jan. 1871 and Feb. 1871 (afterwards "Narrative").
[12] Denison, Soldiering, 174.
[13] PAC MG9 E 29 Vol. 26, Denison Diary for 1870. Denison left for Ottawa on April 7. He was in Ottawa from the 9th to the 28th.
[14] Denison, Soldiering, 174.
[15] Denison, Soldiering, 176, 179; Struggle, 34.
[16] Adrian Preston, The South African Diaries of Sir Garnet Wolseley, -1875, 46.
[17] PAC RG9 IIA1, "Instructions Issued to Wolseley", May 26, 1870. The instructions were signed by James Lindsay, Lt. Gen., officer commanding.
[18] "Narrative", Part II, 52ff.
[19] S.J. Dawson, "Report on the Red River Expedition" in Volunteer Review, July 10, 1871.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Denison, Soldiering, 177; Denison, Struggle, 34-5; Huyshe, The Red River Expedition, (afterwards Expedition), 81.
[23] S.J. Dawson, "Report", in Volunteer Review, Aug. 7, 1871.
[24] "Narrative", Part II, 71-2.
[25] Ibid.

[26] Denison, Soldiering, 177; Denison, Struggle, 37.
[27] Denison, Struggle, 48.
[28] Begg's Journal, June 28, 1870, 385.
[29] "Report...1874", Taché's deposition, 36.
[30] Ibid.
[31] "Report...1874", 39.
[32] "Report...1874", 40.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Denison, Struggle, 35-6.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Denison, Struggle, 37.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Denison, Struggle, 43; Telegraph, July 23, 1870.
[41] Both the Globe and the Telegraph published numerous short accounts. For a good general study see "The Orange Order in Toronto" in Gregory Kealy, Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism, 1867-1892, U. of Toronto press, 1980.
[42] Globe, September 21, 1870.
[43] Denison, Struggle, 43.
[44] Meanwhile, if George H. Young, the son of Rev. George Young, is to be believed, the rope that tied Scott's hands was in the empty coffin at Fort Garry, waiting to be exhumed when the supposed grave was examined in October of 1870. See Saskatchewan Archives, George H. Young, Historical Paper No. 1, "Notes of 1869-70", p.22. The account of the meeting is in the Telegraph, July 23, 1870. See also Willson, The Life of Lord Strathcona, 263.
[45] Captain James Bennett received an appointment to the Civil Service on Feb. 11, 1871. It was a reward for services rendered. See PAC Macdonald Papers, Microfilm C29, Macdonald to R.A. Harrison, Jan. 23, 1871.
[46] Denison, Struggle, 42.
[47] "Report...1874", Taché's deposition, 40-1.
[48] Ibid. Dom Benoît, La Vie de Mgr. Taché, Vol. 2, 106-9.
[49] "Report...1874", Tachés deposition, 41-2.
[50] PAC Macdonald papers, Vol. 76, Young to Macdonald, August 6 and 9, 1870.
[51] Butler, Great Lone Land, 167-8; Huyshe, Expedition, 141; PAC MG 29 E5, M. Bell Irvine, "Journal of the Red River Expedition", 83.
[52] Huyshe, Expedition, 155; Dawson in Volunteer Review, July 24, 1871; Captain J. Dundas, "Journal of the Red River Expedition", Aug. 9, 1870; Robert Machray, Life of Robert Machray, 211; Irvine, "Journal", 99.
[53] Telegraph, Sept. 8, 1870.
[54] Ibid.
[55] New Nation, Aug. 13, 1870.
[56] Some historians have written as though there were problems about the identity of this man. However, both Dubuc of La Minerve and Royal of Le Nouveau Monde recorded his arrival at Fort Garry. Dubuc (La Minerve, Sept. 10) referred to him as "un bourgeois d'un des forts de la Compagnie de la Bai d'Hudson", while Royal (Le Nouveau Monde, Sept. 10), misspelled the name as "Stuart".
[57] R.G. MacBeth, Making of the Canadian West, 87; R.G. MacBeth, Romance of Western Canada, 161.
[58] La Minerve, Sept. 9 and 10, 1870; Irvine, "Journal", 116; Riddell, The Red River Expedition of 1870, 129.
[59] Huyshe, Expedition, 196; Irvine, "Journal", 117.
[60] Huyshe, Expedition, 196; Sun River (Montana) Sun, June 12, 1884.
[61] Telegraph, Sept. 10 (Fort Garry, Aug. 27), 1870; Benjamin Suite, "L'Expédition Militaire de Manitoba", in Revue Canadienne, juillet et août, 1871.
[62] Queen's University Library, Redvers Buller to Henrietta Buller, Aug. 24, 1870; Irvine, "Journal", 119; M. Bell Irvine, Journal of the Red River Expedition, 119.
[63] Beckles Willson, The Life of Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, 264-5; Beckles Willson, Lord Strathcona: The Story of His Life, 168-9.
[64] La Minerve, Sept. 10, 1870, identifying them as "Poitras, Dauphiné and Pagé; Le Nouveau Monde, Sept. 10, 1870; Telegraph, Sept. 8, 1870; Wolseley's report to Lindsay as quoted in Rev. George Young's "Reminiscences"

in Christian Guardian, June 28, 1893. See also Riel's "Memoir", Le Métis, Feb. 28, 1874; Riddell, The Red River Expedition of 1870, 129.

[45] PAC Macdonald Papers, Vol. 76, Young to Macdonald, Aug. 6, 1870.

Wolseley's Anarchy

One of the most interesting fictions of Canadian history is the regime ostensibly headed by Donald Smith in Manitoba between August 24 – when the troops which had invaded Manitoba under the command of Colonel Garnet Wolseley occupied Fort Garry – and September 6, when Lieutenant-governor Archibald's commission was read at the levee.[1] The events of this fourteen-day period are fascinating, and raise interesting questions.

It had been expected that Archibald would arrive at Fort Garry at or about the same time as the troops of the Expedition. However he did not arrive until the evening of September 2.[2] Accordingly, when Wolseley arrived there was no one to tell him what to do, no one to give him a requisition in writing, as mentioned in article 17 of his instructions, or with whom to have a "difference of opinion", as mentioned in article 18.[3] He was in a position of complete supremacy in Manitoba. It is curious that no one has suggested that he ought to have been made to face a court martial upon his return to Ottawa because of the way he and his troops behaved, both at Red River and during the approach to Red River.

Wolseley's first instruction reminded him that his was "an errand of peace" which "will serve as an assurance to the inhabitants of the Red River Settlement...that they have a place in the regard and Counsels of England and may rely upon the Imperial protection of the British Sceptre." In the absence of a lieutenant-governor why did he not either act as acting lieutenant-governor or declare martial law? Why did he not use his troops to give the inhabitants of Red River the Imperial protection so explicitly referred to in this first of his instructions?

The answer is probably to be found in Wolseley's disobedience of article 24 of his instructions:

> The Imperial character of the Force with entire freedom from all sectional feelings should be maintained.

On his "mission of peace" he had approached Fort Garry in as warlike a manner as possible under the circumstances and did not know what to do next when he found peace there. Denison was not there to think for him.

Let us consider alternatives. Suppose that Wolseley had listened to the couriers who had been sent by Riel to make contact with the Expedition. They would have told him that Riel was waiting for him to send emissaries whom he would receive with courtesy and hospitality. On their return the Force could have come and occupied the Fort. Riel would have been there to tell Wolseley to carry on with the preparations for the stationing of a force there over the coming winter, and that meanwhile he would wait to turn over the government to Archibald when he arrived. It was in such terms that Cartier had spoken to Ritchot.

However, "indignation meetings" and the Ontario press had already found Riel guilty of murder and had sent Wolseley to punish him. The first alternative was not possible.

Let us consider a second alternative. Suppose that, as late as the time in the morning when the three councillors Dauphinais, Pagé and Poitras were taken prisoner, Wolseley had spoken to these men civilly and questioned them. They could have told him that, while it appeared that Riel and the others had left, there was still a functioning infrastructure of government in the province which only needed to be assured that it could continue functioning and it would do so. This would have been especially important in the case of the police force, which had now kept satisfactory order for many months.

Wolseley had robbed himself of both these alternatives. If there was anarchy in the province it was an anarchy which had been created by Colonel Wolseley and his Expeditionary Force.

There were "influential people" who requested that Wolseley assume the position of acting lieutenant-governor of the province. Wolseley stated that he had refused because to do so would have been illegal.[4]

Some people asked him to declare that a state of martial law existed. Wolseley replied that to have proclaimed it would have been unwarrantable because the "rebels had bolted without firing a shot".[5] This is rather convoluted reasoning. His was an "errand of peace" and yet the "rebels" had robbed him of his opportunity to give the people the "Imperial protection of the British Sceptre" by not firing a shot!

A declaration of martial law would, in practice, have meant closing the saloons in Winnipeg or at least declaring them to be out of bounds to the soldiers and voyageurs. His failure to do so instantly made people recall that Riel had kept order during the New-Year's season of 1869 and 1870 by the simple expedient of asking the saloon-keepers not to sell liquor during that season.[6]

To be fair to Wolseley, he may have thought he had no choice in this. It may be that he would have faced a mutiny. Soldiers who had gone for many days of hard work and bad weather without a rum ration[7] might not have tolerated in silence the need to obey an "out of bounds" order where the saloons of Winnipeg and St. Boniface were concerned. There were several saloons and the soldiers found them all. The men who could handle their liquor drank it and the men who could not drank it and ended by rolling in the mud. These men knew that in a very few days most of them had to go back through that wilderness country again.

Wolseley's proclamation of June 30 had stated that, among other things, the "strictest order and discipline" would be maintained.[8] The events of August 24 and the following days made a mockery of this. Wolseley tried to shift responsibility to the reluctant shoulders of

Donald Smith of the Hudson's Bay Company. Wolseley was using the argument that the Hudson's Bay Company were the rulers "de jure" of the country. He wished to pretend that the events of the past year had not happened. In fact, as Smith pointed out, Manitoba had legally been a province since July 15. However, Wolseley persisted, and in the face of repeated requests and the painfully obvious fact that Wolseley did not know what to do, Smith said that he would act.[9]

Certain Canadians and a few of Riel's enemies in the events of the previous winter followed along behind the troops and were immediately asking for the issuing of warrants for the arrests of the provisional government leaders. Wolseley said that he did not have the power to issue such warrants. Donald Smith knew that he did not have that power either, but he was astute enough to know that the power to issue such warrants still existed among the men who had been among the "public officers and functionaries holding office in Rupert's Land...." Section 6 of the Rupert's Land Act stated that these men were to continue to hold office after the union with Canada. Section 36 of the Manitoba act confirmed this.[10] These men were known. Some had even served under the Provisional Government.

It was not easy to find someone willing to issue such warrants. The Provisional Government had had much approval and considerable support even in the Lower Settlement and peoples' sense of fair play was outraged by what they saw happening. One magistrate, Smith told later, was sent for to issue a warrant. He "threw up his commission". Another was asked to issue one and he resigned. Smith looked again at the Rupert's Land Act and refused to accept the man's resignation. A warrant was "immediately issued".[11]

The people of Red River had never seen such disgusting scenes as they saw in the days immediately after the arrival of the Expeditionary Force.[12] As Dubuc put it, in La Minerve,

"people get drunk, people quarrel, people fight and nobody intervenes...Colonel Wolseley says that he did not come here to act as a policemen...."[13]

Colonel Wolseley now worked as though he had only one object in view – to get himself and the regular troops out of Manitoba and back to eastern Canada. On August 29 the first detachment of regular troops started in the boats on their return to the East by way of the Winnipeg river. By September 3 almost the entire 60th, with the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers, had left Fort Garry by boat. One company of the 60th, Captain Buller's, was sent by way of Mr. Snow's road to the North-West angle of the Lake of the Woods as an experiment. The company of the 1st Ontario Rifles, which had been left as a garrison at Fort Frances, met this company of the 60th at the North-West angle, and there exchanged boats and pack-horses. Meanwhile, by August 27 the brigades of Ontario and Quebec militia had begun to arrive at Fort Garry, and arrangements were begun for quartering these two battalions at Fort Garry and the Lower Fort over the coming winter.[14]

The Settlement's saloons now had a change of clientele, but the general picture had not changed. The correspondent of the Telegraph found himself forced to report, on September 3:

> I do not feel safe...when one sees maddened half-breeds...staggering, reeling, frantic Indians...maddened, blinded Christians...a sense of safety is rather hard to realize. I do not believe that any village was ever in so short a time so thoroughly demoralized as Winnipeg, since our arrival – for Riel with all his faults – kept up an excellent police force.[15]

The Rev. George Young made the acquaintance of men of the newly-arrived 1st Ontario Rifles, and decided that there was a way that he and an unofficial "committee" could make use of these young men who, he soon learned, were to be stationed at Fort Garry. He went to work on it.

The Rev. George Young is probably as responsible as any writer for the development of the legend of the "murder" of "poor Scott", a legend which treats that individual as an obscure, but loyal, young Irishman who was singled out, for no apparent reason, to be executed on March 4. Young wrote his account just before September 6, when it was handed to the correspondent of the Telegraph. The broad lines of the account are essentially the same as in the one he later gave in Manitoba Memories. Young stated that he wrote the account because Scott had requested that he make a "true statement". But Young had other motives in mind when he now wrote a statement, fully six months after the event, when one could as well have been made at any time during that interval. Young's story was published in the Telegraph of September 22, and was read in Manitoba about October 10, allowing the same time for the paper to reach Red River as the manuscript had taken to reach Toronto. Archibald and his advisers were then attempting to implement a policy of "letting bygones be bygones". Having a story of Scott's "murder" appear in October was not calculated to assist that policy. The men with whom Young was working did not want to let "bygones be bygones".[16]

Wolseley had decisions to make concerning the disposition of the units chosen to remain in garrison at the two forts. Article 14 of his instructions gave him a certain discretion in this. His decision was unfortunate. He decided to send all of the regular force back to eastern Canada. This meant that both militia units left at the forts were volunteer units lacking the training, steadiness and discipline of a regular force. A company of regular troops left at Fort Garry would have been an example to the Volunteer companies in residence with it, and would have been of great assistance to the Lieutenant-governor. Begg wrote that the settlers were "sorry"[17] to see the men of the 60th ordered to return to the East. In the French-speaking parishes this sorrow was tinged with strong unease. While regular units had always been regarded with

affection because of their steadiness and discipline, the thought of two untrained militia units in their midst, along with the absence of an amnesty, was now cause for concern.[18] "Where would the two militia units be?" they wondered.

Wolseley's decisions on this point were, to say the least, remarkable, and force us to wonder what the man's true motives were. The Quebec Rifles had been brought up to strength by enlistments from Ontario. There were, nevertheless, a significant number of men who were French-speaking. Wolseley chose to station this regiment at Lower Fort Garry, in the most English-speaking part of the Settlement.[19] The Ontario Rifles were nearly all English-speaking. They were stationed at Upper Fort Garry, in proximity to two of the most French-speaking parishes, St. Boniface West and St. Boniface East!

Had they been stationed at Lower Fort Garry, the anti-French, anti-Catholic attitudes of a number of men in several companies of the Ontario Rifles would have had no opportunity for expression. They could have passed the winter harmlessly among people of their own language and religious persuasion. On the other hand, had the Quebec Rifles been stationed at Upper Fort Garry, the French-speaking and Roman Catholic men of the regiment could have passed a more agreeable time. Catholics could have attended mass at St. Boniface Cathedral. Each French-speaking Volunteer could have been a link between his regiment and the adjacent population. A great deal of useful state-building could have gone on. The Métis people of the southern parishes could have come into Winnipeg or Fort Garry and learned that theirs was still a country where two languages were spoken and where the Métis could continue to play a vital part.

There can be no doubt that Bishop Taché saw this at the time, as there can be no doubt that Archibald came to realize it when he learned the demographic facts of the new province. As it was, however, Wolseley's decision sentenced the Ontario Rifles to become that worst of all

military phenomena, a poorly-behaved army of occupation, and the Quebec Rifles to a winter of useless and frustrated alcoholism. Wolseley had wanted to be named lieutenant-governor of Manitoba, and had lobbied for it.[20] Nothing more clearly reveals his utter unsuitability for that position than the way he exercised the discretionary powers granted him in his instructions.

On Thursday night, September 1, the pontoon bridge on the Assiniboine, the bridge which had given John Bruce and his public works department such concern in the spring, was cut. Two men had been seen crossing it not long before it was cut.[21] One would have assumed that the securing of such a bridge – on the main road into the Settlement from the south – would have been seen of great importance, and that sentries would have been posted at both ends of it.

Ryder Larsen, a man long sought by the Provisional Government for his part in the death of a man named Johnston in December of 1869, came to the Fort and wished to surrender himself to Wolseley. Wolseley said he could take no action in the case, and Larsen remained at large![22]

Lawlessness appeared to be on the increase in the area west of Winnipeg. Father Kavanagh, parish priest at White Horse Plain, was returning home in the dusk from Winnipeg when he was accosted by someone on horseback a couple of miles from the village. There was the report of a revolver, and the mysterious rider disappeared at a gallop. Kavanagh's horse reared and the priest was thrown to the ground. The horse was caught by a member of the Bourke family.[23]

In the parish of Baie St. Paul, west of White Horse Plain, lived an elderly man called by the Métis "Wabishka" Morin. He lived alone on a property he had developed there. On Saturday, September 3, Morin was visited by seven men who tore down portions of fences, threatened his life, and left, taking with them several items of Morin's property.[24]

When Joseph Royal reported this incident on September 6 it was known that Archibald had arrived and that he had not brought an amnesty with him. Royal reported that many of the people who felt compromised or threatened had gone to the border country near Pembina, and, unless an amnesty was declared, would only come back to get their families and leave for the West. The departure of the Métis people, begun earlier in the season with the news that the Expedition would not be opposed, was continuing.[25]

The movement was noticed by others also. The Manitoba News-Letter for September 20 reported a correspondent from White Horse Plain as saying that

> a good many of Riel's "loyal men" are selling their claims dirt cheap and fleeing from the wrath to come; and asking why don't some of the new arrivals come into this locality and buy farms while the "truly loyal" are scared? Thanks to this hint they will do so.[26]

It appeared to some that there was some sort of campaign under way at this time to dislodge the Métis people from their holdings along the Assiniboine and Red Rivers. A correspondent of the St. Paul Weekly Press came to that conclusion at that time, calling it a "reign of Terror":

> [I]ts purpose [is] driving out by threats or actual violence all the French half-breed [sic] population, all American citizens, the Hudson's Bay Company and Governor Archibald.[27]

When Archibald arrived on September 2, one of his first duties was to give official approval to plans which Wolseley had made for alterations to Fort Garry to accommodate the Volunteers.[28] It is to be noted that Wolseley in this case paid no attention to his own theory as to who was the government of the province!

There is no record that Archibald pressed for the taking of special measures to restore order in the Settlement, reasoning, one may assume, that if the population had somehow survived the recent number of days it would no doubt live through the next. While he must take his share

of responsibility for the events of early September of 1870, it is difficult to envisage what he could have done, given the situation which then existed. He was well-advised to set to work, advertising the levee and seeking information as to the lay of the land in the new province. That is what he proceeded to do.

The presence of Archibald in the Settlement after September 2 forced some people to think of the Settlement's manners. The New Nation for August 27 had commented that no efforts were being made to present an address to Archibald. J.J. Hargrave, the secretary of the old Council of Assiniboia, bestirred himself and issued a circular on August 29. A meeting was held which was attended by Donald Smith and several members of that defunct council. An address was "agreed to unanimously". Letters were then sent to other members asking their concurrence.[29]

While this effort to resuscitate the old council was being made a "committee" composed of Michael Power, Dr. James Lynch and Wm. A. Farmer was busy introducing the ghost of Thomas Scott into the affairs of the new province.[30] It was decided to ask Donald Smith for permission to exhume the remains of Thomas Scott and give them "Christian burial".[31] Smith did not give his permission, saying that for a number of reasons it was wise to defer action on this request for the present time.[32]

One of Archibald's first acts after his arrival was to have a notice inserted in the New Nation announcing a levee for September 6 at the Governor's residence, at which his Lieutenant-governor's commission would be read.[33] The levee was held on the afternoon of that day, in the drawing-room of the residence. In the actual ceremony Colonel Wolseley and J.J. Hargrave stood at Archibald's right, while Bishops Taché and Machray stood at his left. When the commission had been read the address "agreed to" was read by Donald Smith. Then seven

members of the old Council of Assiniboia were presented by Smith, acting as president, Northern Council, Hudson's Bay Company.

Archibald made his reply, thanking them for their kind words of welcome. "With these feelings pervading the body of the population," he concluded, "we may look with sanguine hope to the maintenance of order, to the establishment of good laws, and to a rapidly increasing prosperity."[34]

Among the members of the old Council present was Thomas Bunn.[35] He was from the Lower Settlement parish of St. Clement's. He had been for two years a member of the Council of Assiniboia, and had been a member of every elected body during the insurrectionary period. He had been chairman of the mass meetings of January 19 and 20. He had served as secretary of state of the Provisional Government.[36] He alone represented the regime which had been providing order in the Settlement and Province up to August 24. Probably no one present was in a better position to estimate the "feelings" pervading the population that day. Bunn's presence at the levee was the cause of "considerable excitement" in Winnipeg. The Telegraph reported that while the levee was being held certain people were distributing placards. These placards carried messages asking questions and inciting action: "Who consorted with murderers?" – "Tar and feather Tom Bunn" – "Catch the secretary if you can, and arouse the people".[37]

The Telegraph also quite properly noticed the absence of the president of the Provisional Government from the levee, as well as the absence of Lépine and O'Donoghue.[38] These were people who Cartier had informed Ritchot should govern the country until the arrival of the lieutenant-governor. According to all the criteria by which civilized governments the world over are judged, these three had governed the Settlement – and the Province – well during the spring and summer of 1870. They had been acknowledged in many ways, by local people, by the

Hudson's Bay Company[39] and by foreigners, as the only viable government at Red River, and the Settlement – and Province – had known peace after the dramatic events of the previous winter.

The three men were not at the Lieutenant-governor's levee because an Imperial army, supposed to be a "mission of peace", had come into the new Canadian province behaving as an invading army, sending out no emissaries to the Provisional Government, but rather approaching Fort Garry in a hostile manner, making prisoners of peaceful farmers and councillors, breaking down the gates of Hudson's Bay Company property, looting and destroying personal possessions[40] (See Appendix "A"). The officer commanding the army had then refused to use his troops in such a way as to preserve law and order, pending the establishment of a proper civil administration by the new Lieutenant-governor.

The legacy of this so-called "mission of peace" was to be Manitoba's chief problem in the months to come.

Appendix "A"

Letter to Mr. Donald Smith

"Dakotah, U.S.,
September 23, 1870

Sir: -

We can never forget the gross violation of country and property in which we have been treated. Expecting something far different from an honourable British officer, I, as the chosen head of the Provisional Government, which has administered here on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, since last November, expected to receive Colonel Wolseley and Governor Archibald at Fort Garry and formally deliver up the Government. My guards were instructed to fire a salute and the enclosed address was to have been read to the appointed Governor in token of submission to the regime of Canada, with our rights and liberties guaranteed to us. This proceeding was denied to us, and we fortunately had news of the temper of injustice animating the new coming (sic) and if we are said to have fled it was to save ourselves and them from bloodshed.

You have already ascertained the truth of this from your people here – namely, that we remained at our posts until the last moment, only from a sense of the duty we owed our people. – Yours respectfully,

Louis Riel"

- Beckles Willson, The Life of Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, 260.

[1] See, for examples, G.F.G. Stanley, The Birth of Western Canada, 142; G.F.G. Stanley, Louis Riel, 159; W.L. Morton, Manitoba: A History, 144.
[2] C.S.P. 1871 (No. 20), Archibald to Howe, Sept. 10, 1870.
[3] Wolseley's instructions were signed by Lindsay on May 26, 1870. They are in PAC, RG9 II A1, Vol. 30.
[4] "Narrative..." in Blackwood's Magazine, Part III, Feb. 1871, 179, (afterwards "Narrative"); Benjamin Suite, "L'Expéditionn militaire de Manitoba" in Revue Canadienne, juillet et août, 1871, 44..
[5] Ibid.
[6] Begg's Journal, 245-6.
[7] Huyshe, Red River Expedition, 114-7; Young, Manitoba Memories, 183, 190.
[8] New Nation, July 23, 1870.
[9] Manitoban, Dec. 11, 1870, in an account of an election campaign meeting. See Beckles Willson, Lord Strathcona: The Story of His Life, 105-6, and Beckles Willson, The Life of Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, 258; "Narrative", 179.
[10] Begg, Creation of Manitoba, 407-8.
[11] Manitoban, Dec. 11, 1870, in an account of an election campaign meeting. See Denison, Reminiscences of the Red River Rebellion, "Statement of Thomas Lusted", 36-7; Willson, The Life of Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, 259.
[12] Young, Manitoba Memories, 189-190; Butler, Great Lone Land, 192-3.
[13] La Minerve, 10 sept. (Fort Garry, 27 août), 1870.
[14] Huyshe, Red River Expedition, 201,203.
[15] Telegraph, Sept. 16 (Fort Garry, Sept. 3), 1870.
[16] Young, Manitoba Memories, Chapter 8, 131-147; Manitoba News Letter, October 11, 1870.
[17] Begg, Creation of Manitoba, 392.
[18] The French parishes had begun worrying about this in May. See Begg's Journal, 375, May 24 entry.
[19] Le Nouveau Monde, 17 sept. (Fort Garry, 3 sept.), 1870: "On comprend que les officiers du second bataillon préfèrenient cantonner ici [Fort Garry] mais l'autorité militure a cru prudent d'agir autrement." ("We understand that the officers of the second battalion would prefer to be stationed here [Fort Garry] but the military authority thought it wise to act otherwise.")
[20] University of Alberta, Wolseley Papers, Reel 1, No. 10, complete Letters of Garnet Wolseley: letter to Brother Dick, April 6, 1870; to his mother, May 14, 1870. See also Sir George Arthur, The Letters of Lord and Lady Wolseley, letters of April 25 and 27, 1870. See also Adrian Preston, Sir Garnet Wolseley's South African Diaries, 46.
[21] New Nation, Sept. 3, 1870.
[22] Manitoba News-Letter, April 29, 1871.
[23] New Nation, Sept. 3, 1870; Globe, Sept. 27, 1870; Manitoba News-Letter, Sept. 13, 1870.
[24] Globe, Sept. 27, 1870; Le Nouveau Monde, 23 sept., 1870.
[25] PRO CO 537, Bishop of Rupert's Land to Sir John Young, July 1, 1870: "Many of the French have left and are leaving".
[26] USNARS microfilm T24, Reel 1, Manitoba News-Letter, Sept. 20, 1870.
[27] St. Paul Weekly Press, Oct. 6, 1870.
[28] Volunteer Review, July 31, 1871, 493, Wolseley to Dawson, Sept. 5, 1870: "The Lieutenant-Governor authorizes me to add that he concurs in this opinion."
[29] PAM MG14 B30, Colin Inkster papers, Box 2/2, File 32, J.J. Hargrave to John Inkster, August 31, 1870; Oliver, The Canadian North-West, Vol. 1, 620.
[30] Globe, Sept. 22 (Fort Garry, Sept. 6), 1870.
[31] Telegraph, Sept. 22, 1870.
[32] Ibid.
[33] New Nation, Sept. 3, 1870.
[34] Telegraph, Sept. 22, 1870; Oliver, The Canadian North-West, Vol. 1, 620-1.
[35] Telegraph, Sept. 22, 1870.
[36] Begg's Journal, 265, 341.
[37] Telegraph, Sept. 22, 1870.

[38] Ibid.
[39] "Writings...Riel", Volume 1, 69, Macdavish to Riel, April 5, 1870; See also "Correspondence – 1870", 218.
[40] Riel's statement about this is in Beckles Willson, The Life of Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, 260, letter from Riel to Donald Smith, September 23, 1870. The editors of The Collected Writings of Louis Riel do not appear to have seen this.

Schultz and the Beginning of the "Reign of Terror"

The members of the "Canada First" committee had plenty of cause for satisfaction in September of 1870. While they had not been able to prevent Macdonald and Cartier from receiving and negotiating with the Red River delegates, they had managed to have the two "rebel" delegates, Ritchot and Scott, arrested and rearrested, and the news of the arrests had served to help arouse the Ontario public.[1] It was due to their efforts also that much of Ontario was "enraged" about the "murder" of "poor Scott", and this had diverted attention from the blunderings and killing of Sutherland and Parisien at Kildonan.[2] Dr. Lynch's letters and his interview with Sir John Young had been crowned with success, since no amnesty had yet been issued to those involved in the Red River troubles.[3] "Indignation meetings" had been very dramatic, and the government had been forced to have Archibald follow the Red River Expeditionary Force rather than follow the much easier route through the United States. The commander of the force, Wolseley, had carried out the "Canada First" policy rather than the pacific policy insisted on by the Colonial Office.[4] Lastly, the groundwork was being laid by the North-West Emigration Aid Society for the migration to Manitoba in 1871 of dozens of Ontario families.[5]

What could be done in the East had been done. The next moves would have to be made by Schultz.

Schultz had had a very productive spring and summer in the East. For someone whose fortunes had been "destroyed" he did a great deal of travelling during the more than four months he was there.[6] He had conferences with Cartier in Ottawa and requested a seat in the Senate.[7] He was able to reestablish his credit rating among the business men of Montreal.[8] While he took part in the effort to prevent the issuing of an amnesty, both his motives and his methods were

different from those of the eastern members. He explained matters in a letter to Cartier when "extraordinary rumors" circulated that an amnesty was to be proclaimed:

> I feel that in justice to the people of Red River in fairness even to myself I must not leave Canada till it is distinctly understood how the loyal portion of the settlement and particularly the English are to be classed in the coming economy. ON IT WILL DEPEND WHETHER I GO TO RED RIVER AT ONCE AND QUICKLY OR WHETHER I GO IN AFTER THE TROOPS HAVE ARRIVED THERE [emphasis mine].[9]

Schultz had been among the first to ask for the issuing of an amnesty for those who took part in the counter movement at Kildonan where Sutherland and Parisien were killed.[10] At the "Indignation meeting" in Toronto in April he had spoken for a policy of letting bygones be bygones.[11]

There were, however, reasons for taking a sober second thought. Schultz knew very well that those who, like Taché, were asking for the announcement of an amnesty, quite rightly had him and his followers in mind as much as anybody. Schultz well knew, too, that very shortly after he had spoken in Toronto the Provisional Government had declared an amnesty for "all those whom political differences led astray for a time."[12]

In his travels in the East, however, Schultz noticed that the deaths of Parisien and Sutherland had been forgotten. All the talk was of the "murder" of "poor Scott", and of how the Métis leaders ought to be considered as apart from their temporarily misguided followers, who had acted, so this reasoning went, not from policy but under duress or on the spur of the moment. Only Riel, O'Donoghue and Lépine, went this argument, should be considered in this matter of the "murder" of "poor Scott". They had planned it and forced their reluctant followers to carry it out. Schultz was not one to discourage this line of thinking.[13]

Schultz crisscrossed Ontario, meeting with the men of "Canada First", meeting with businessmen in Ottawa and Montreal and speaking to meetings of sympathizers. He was the "chief sufferer", and the "suffering loyalist" who had lost his all for the Canadian cause in the North-West. Here and there he dropped remarks about going west ahead of the troops and arranging with the Indians for a peaceful passage through their territory for the troops.[14]

In early July he took a business trip to St. Paul, Minnesota, where he stayed at the Merchants' Hotel.[15] In order for him to reopen his businesses in Manitoba he had to arrange for shipments of goods to be sent from St. Paul to Winnipeg just after the arrival of the troops and before the onset of winter. Evidently he had received some information as to how he and the English were to figure in the "coming economy" of Red River, because instead of going on to Winnipeg, as he could well have done, he returned to Ontario to go west again "after the troops". He was in London on July 18 and was instrumental, with Denison, in calling the "indignation meeting" which so disturbed Cartier and Sir John Young.[16]

Early August found Schultz and a party of men on board the "Algoma" bound for Prince Arthur's landing. He had been joined by Dr. Lynch, Walter Lynch, J.J. Setter, Mr. Geddes, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Cousins and P.G. Laurie, who was soon to take the editorial chair of the Manitoba News-Letter. The correspondent of the Toronto Telegraph made the ninth person in the party. At the Sault Schultz purchased a canoe and had it christened "The Loyalist". The party left Prince Arthur's Landing on August 9.[17] They reached Fort Frances on August 21 and left on the 22nd.[18] In the days following they made their leisurely way along the old voyageur highway down the Winnipeg River that the troops had followed a few days before. He then spent some time consulting with his former allies in the Lower Settlement.[19]

A comparison with Archibald's time in making the same trip is instructive. The Schultz party left Prince Arthur's Landing on August 9. Archibald left there on the 14th. Schultz reached Fort Frances on August 21 and left it on the 22nd. Archibald arrived at the same place on the 23rd and left it on the 24th. Five days behind Schultz at Thunder Bay, Archibald was only two days behind him at Fort Frances. Archibald arrived at Fort Garry on September 2.[20] Schultz was in Winnipeg on September 6, and was immediately noticed by the Globe:

> There is no doubt about it, and there is no use denying it, Dr. Schultz is the coming man in Red River – provided always that he wishes to come.[21]

The same day, September 6, the correspondent of the Telegraph was more forthright:

> Dr. Schultz, Dr. Lynch and others, have arrived here and already their vigorous and not unnatural detestation of Riel, and those connected with him, has commenced to work...Dr. Schultz is likely to be the most active member of what may be called the anti-French party, and remembering the sufferings and animosity with which he was pursued by Riel, one cannot wonder at the fact...The fear arising from that fact is that he may be led into some action which will do harm to himself and the interests which he espouses...It is very probable that some rough-and-tumble work will take place here, for a Nemesis is stalking abroad here, and the friends of Riel are in a perilous state....[22]

"Pickets", the Globe reported the same day, "are out tonight, owing to some rumored intention as to burning the houses of some obnoxious people...."

The Globe had confirmation of a Telegraph report of the campaign against Thomas Bunn:

> Since the levee this afternoon placards of a character calculated to disquiet certain persons resident here have been posted about Winnipeg. One is a picture of a man hanging, with the assertion written underneath that this is the proper fate of Thomas Bunn...Another placard asks, "What should be done with the consort of murderers?"...It is asserted that a tar barrel and a liberal supply of feathers have been got together....

There is no doubt that the "anti-French" party had decided not to let bygones be bygones, and that by early September Schultz was regarded as the leader of that party. He cannot personally have had anything to do with the incidents which took place west of Winnipeg a few days earlier and after the arrival of the Expedition. The same is true of the dragging by the heels in the mud of Alfred Scott, Red River delegate and member of the Legislative Assembly of Assiniboia.[23] However, the reward offered by Schultz's father-in-law James Farquharson for the capture of Riel, Lépine and O'Donoghue may be viewed in a different light. The reward was first mentioned by the Globe correspondent on September 2, when Schultz was in the Settlement.[24] If it is true, as La Minerve reported, that Archibald prevented the publication of an announcement of this reward in the New Nation, one of Archibald's very first acts after his arrival was to forestall the efforts of the "anti-French" party to get this message to readers throughout the Settlement.[25]

Schultz's route to Winnipeg led him through the parishes which had given support to the February counter-movement. It is not unreasonable to assume that Schultz conferred not only with Henry Prince but with such people as E.H.G.G. Hay, Donald Gunn, Jr., John Tait and others who had served on the "general council for the force".[26] This group would have experienced a sense of satisfaction as they heard the report which was current in the Settlement at the time and was to appear in a Telegraph report:

> They [the French Métis] are said to be moving off, and some have it that they are concentrating in various localities. Fear, I think, is the chief cause of their moving....[27]

There are several versions of what happened on the morning of September 6, when Schultz and some companions invaded the home of Thomas Spence, editor of the New Nation, terrifying his family.[28] While accounts vary as to the number of men that Schultz brought with

him and as to the number of pistols that were pointed at Spence, all agree that Schultz pulled the bed-clothes from Spence's bed and horse-whipped him.[29] Schultz stated that he was doing so because of an insult to Mrs. Schultz that Spence had uttered while Schultz was imprisoned in Fort Garry the previous winter. One account says that Schultz gave Spence a revolver and that Spence made no use of it. Another insists that Schultz shook hands with Spence after horsewhipping him. The Telegraph does not mention damage to the New Nation's printing machinery, while the Globe says only that "the band then descended into the office, chased away the workmen, and threw all the material out of doors". The report published by La Minerve states that an essential piece of the New Nation press had been removed and that this piece could not be replaced by any local blacksmith.[30] This report was corroborated by what we know of subsequent events.

It is necessary here to trace briefly the history of the two commercial presses then in Winnipeg. The Nor'Wester had been published since 1859, part of that time under the ownership of Schultz and part of the time under the ownership of Bown but with Schultz's influence in the background. During the troubles of 1869 Coldwell and Ross undertook to found a competing newspaper, the Red River Pioneer, and a press was brought into the Settlement for that purpose. The first issue was partly printed when the press was seized by the National Committee of the Métis.[31] During the month of December, 1869, there were two presses in Winnipeg but no publishing newspaper, the Nor'Wester having also been seized and placed under guard.[32] Coldwell and Company sold the Red River Pioneer press to H.M. Robinson,[33] and a new newspaper began to appear January 7, 1870, the first issue containing the front and back pages of the defunct Red River Pioneer dated December 1, 1869! All during the life of the New Nation in 1870 the old Nor'Wester press lay idle. The New Nation continued to appear

until September 3, 1870, and it was this newspaper that published the announcement of Archibald's first levee.[34] But for Schultz's attack on Spence and the removal of a portion of the New Nation press, that newspaper would, no doubt, have continued its publishing career. Between September 3, when the last issue of the New Nation appeared, and September 13, when the Manitoba News-Letter's first issue was published, the province of Manitoba was without a newspaper. The Nor'Wester press was sold at auction on September 16, 1870, for thirty-seven pounds ten shillings.[35]

Possession of a newspaper was part of the strategy worked out by Schultz in Ontario during the previous summer in conversations with Colonel Denison and others. On board the "Algoma" near Thunder Bay in August Schultz had reported by letter to Denison saying that

> Bown's printer Laurie joined me at the Sault and we are now in a position to revive the Nor'Wester...print moral sentiments or anything you damn please....[36]

Possession of a newspaper was not enough for Schultz. He wanted a monopoly position, at least for a time. Hence the raid on the New Nation and the removal of an important piece. When the New Nation printers went to use the press they discovered that an essential piece was missing.[37] When the new newspaper, the Manitoban, appeared in mid-October it contained an account of how the press's lever had been "broken out" and "stolen". Privates George Lindoff and Christopher Robinson, men of the Ontario Rifles, had fabricated a new lever "with a chisel and hammer".[38]

It is not difficult to guess why the Toronto newspapers, having lionized Schultz during his tours of Ontario, reported the horse-whipping but made no mention of the removal of the lever.

Schultz was not the only person interested in the fate of the New Nation press in early September of 1870. Louis Riel was in hiding in the southern part of the Settlement and hoping to be called on to form a government. He was very curious about that press's welfare. John Bruce paid Riel a visit on September 4, and agreed to take a letter to Joseph Dubuc, then living at St. Boniface. In this letter Riel asked about the press, evidently with a view to asserting a claim to it, either on behalf of himself or on behalf of the Métis people. Dubuc was under the impression that the Manitoba government had taken possession of the press, leaving Mr. Spence in the editorial chair, and said so in his reply to Riel.[39] As proof he stated that the government had paid the printers on September 3, the day that the New Nation published the announcement of Archibald's levee. Dubuc went on to tell Riel that it would be extremely unwise for him to appear at Fort Garry or Winnipeg. Riel could be seen by "traitor" or lukewarm Métis who could betray him. Dubuc did not think that Riel should stay hidden forever, but that he should wait some time before coming out of hiding. "The English are compromising themselves horribly", Dubuc wrote. "Each day some new misdeed strengthens your cause and alienates the honest people."[40] The amnesty could arrive, Dubuc went on, and change everything. In the meantime it appeared that Archibald was well disposed toward the Métis cause. According to Dubuc Archibald "desires and waits for the amnesty as much as anyone". Dubuc had heard of Schultz's horsewhipping of Spence. "Most of the officers," Dubuc wrote, "are indignant about Schultz's conduct, and about the feelings of the English population in general." Dubuc said that Spence had been assaulted twice, and had asked for, and received, the protection of the government. Then, in a postscript, Dubuc added that he had just been informed that he had been wrong in thinking that the Manitoba government had seized the New Nation press.[41] It was Robinson who wanted to resume control of it.

It is probable that at this time Riel was hoping to establish a newspaper friendly to the Métis cause. Such a newspaper – in English or in French or both languages – was certainly needed then by the Métis people. But Dubuc could see that conditions at the Settlement's centre would not permit Riel to begin such a project, even if he could obtain the use of the press. Whether it was the government or Robinson who wanted the use of the New Nation press made no real difference. Dubuc's advice to Riel was "Don't come now."[42] When this advice was followed immediately by the sentence about the officers the inference was abundantly clear. While the score of officers at Fort Garry might be "indignant" at Schultz's conduct there were several hundred Volunteers at Fort Garry who thought differently.

The French-speaking population of Manitoba would have to wait nine long months before their cause was served by the establishment of a French-language newspaper, and when it began publishing no ex-member of the Provisional Government would be at its head.

---

[1] See, above, chapter "Negotiations Leading to the Manitoba Act".
[2] Denison's account of the beginning of this campaign is in his Struggle For Imperial Unity, 25ff.
[3] The best published account of the part played by Dr. Lynch and Sir John Young is probably that of G.F.G. Stanley in Louis Riel, 141-7.
[4] See, above, chapter "Errand, Mission, Expedition".
[5] See, above, chapter "Charles Mair and the North-West Emigration Aid Society".
[6] William Mactavish did not believe that Schultz had lost so heavily as he claimed. See the Globe, June 25, 1870, from the New York Sun, June 24, 1870.
[7] PAC Macdonald Papers, Vol. 103, Schultz to Cartier, May 20, 1870.
[8] See, above, chapter "Negotiations Leading To The Manitoba Act".
[9] PAC Macdonald Papers, Vol. 103, Schultz to Cartier, June 7, 1870.
[10] New Nation, Feb. 18, 1870.
[11] Globe, April 7, 1870.
[12] Bear's Journal, April 19, 1870; New Nation, April 15, 1870.
[13] See news items and editorials in Globe and Telegraph beginning in early April of 1870, and continuing throughout the spring and summer. See also PAC Macdonald Papers, MG 26 A, Vol. 517, Part 2, 422-425, Macdonald to Archibald, Nov. 1, 1870.
[14] Ottawa Citizen, April 26, 1870.
[15] St. Paul Daily Pioneer, July 7, 1870.
[16] Denison, Struggle, 35-6.
[17] Telegraph, Aug. 17, 1870.
[18] PAM MG14 C23 Box 3/6, Diary of Charles Napier Bell for 1870.
[19] PAM MG12 E3 Schultz Papers, Letter 112, Schultz to Archibald, Sept. 6, 1870.
[20] Archibald's movements may be traced by reference to C.S.P. 1871 (No. 20), the diary of Charles Napier Bell mentioned in Note 18 and PAC MG29 E34, Diary of John Andrew Kerr for 1870.
[21] Globe, Sept. 22 (Fort Garry, Sept. 6), 1870.

[22] Telegraph, Sept. 22 (Fort Garry, Sept. 6), 1870.
[23] Globe, Sept. 9 (Fort Garry, August 26), 1870.
[24] Globe, Sept. 19 (Fort Garry, Sept. 2), 1870.
[25] La Minerve, 17 sept. (Fort Garry, 3 sept.), 1870.
[26] St. Paul Daily Pioneer, April 2, 1870.
[27] Telegraph, Sept. 22 (Fort Garry, Sept. 6), 1870. The migration was reported again three days later: "They are going off by the hundreds...."
[28] Spence had had warning and had sought protection: AASB, T8025, Spence to Taché, "Thursday morning". Reports of the incident may be found in the following: Manitoba News-Letter (afterwards News-Letter), Sept. 13, 1870; Telegraph, Sept. 22, 1870; Globe, Sept. 27 (Fort Garry, Sept. 6), 1870; La Minerve, 28 sept. (Fort Garry, 10 Sept.), 1870; Le Nouveau Monde, 8 oct., 1870.
[29] The News-Letter, Sept. 13, 1870, reported that there were "two witnesses". Other reports said "four" and some "six".
[30] La Minerve, 28 sept. (Fort Garry, 10 sept.), 1870.
[31] Begg's Journal, Dec. 2., 1869, 197-8.
[32] Ibid.
[33] New Nation, Jan. 7, 1870, article entitled "History of the Red River Press".
[34] New Nation, Sept. 3, 1870.
[35] News-Letter, Sept. 13, 1870; Telegraph, Sept. 27, 1870, gives the price paid.
[36] Metropolitan Toronto Library, Denison Papers, Schultz to Denison, Aug. 8, 1870.
[37] La Minerve, 28 sept. (Fort Garry, 10 sept.), 1870.
[38] Manitoban, October 15, 1870.
[39] PAM, Dubuc to Riel, 6 sept., 1870.
[40] Ibid: "Les anglais se compromettent horriblement".
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.