entionlly antito lavish -swiftly leclamaour marishment owers of rilv thou f oratory and imr logical dir, your te of the string of he Couneasoning amation. out the e embarictions," approbane,'' and om com-Petition st assernequivoember of thatany lthat he t Petition Sir, for the false e merely ur vulgar e followonsistenncil who purpose their en-

the repe-

e " was

under the rule of a Soldier governing with ignorance, with passion, and with a partiality towards the Soldiery to the extent of conniving at the utmost atrocities." Why, thou insolent defamer of thy betters! thou slanderer of all that is great and honorable! how didst thou dare to make an assertion so unsubstantiated by the slightest proof. Was it because a gallant British officer on the memorable twenty-first of May, by a prompt suppression of Riot, saved the properties and lives of hundreds of citizens, and afterwards received the well-merited thanks of his Commanding Officer for an act which perhaps prevented the City of Montreal from being given over to the attack and plunder of bands of organized thieves and bullies? or was it upon the information given to you by that sapient body the "Town Conscil of Quebec,"those men who stand convicted not only of a gross departure from their municipal functions, by interfering in political matters; but who in defiance of all law, honor and justice prosecuted an Enquete in which the military were a party, as foully, as partially, and as falsely as any have been conducted which disgrace the records of the Inquisition, and who in their besotted ignorance, imagined that the Commander in Chief would, upon their recommendation, break a Standing Rule of the Service, and, in compliance with the wishes of some six or seven impertinent intermeddlers deprive a British Regiment of their side-arms !!! or were these assertions made because your own door was, during a popular commotion, (of which you alone were the cause) guarded and protected by a British Sentinel? Was it from one or all of these causes I ask, that you uttered the slanders in question? or was it because your ambitious mind brooks no superiority? and that conscious of debasement you would reduce every one to your own level? Why is it that you would instil into the minds of British subjects any other feelings than those of esteem and respect for those brave men who have so often been their defenders? Why is it that British officers are so peculiarly selected as the objects of your low and scurrilous abuse? Is it that their honor and bravery are a tacit reproach to your want of those virtues? Why is it that the Governor of this Colony is so often singled out by you in his military capacity? so repeatedly designated "a Soldier?"—from the basest and worst of motives, from a desire to create distinctions which ought never to exist, from a wish to generate