

details to the public than he has given to Dr. Robertson.

In explaining the object of his visit, he added that my address was of a nature to shock the ladies of the Doctor's family. I immediately said that I should be much concerned to have on any occasion given offence to ladies, who had nothing to do with political quarrels, and that there was nothing in my address of a nature to hurt them. He answered, that there was not, but that such proceeded from relationship. Whereupon I said, that that was an inevitable inconvenience attendant on all those who were connected with public men, whose public conduct, when it was criminal, ought not to be sheltered from the most just censure through fear of wounding the sensibility of female relations.

I told Mr. Bellingham that he did not apparently give himself the trouble of informing himself of the facts with which I reproached Dr. Robertson were or were not founded—that as for my part they were supported by affidavits, and justified the reflections and inferences which I drew from them. He told me that it was not his business to inquire into the truth or falsehood of those facts—that a gentleman—his friend—had taken offence at a recent publication, and instructed him to demand an apology or satisfaction—that, in his country, quarrels between public men did not prevent them from giving satisfaction.

I answered that to support himself with examples from his country, it was necessary that he should find some example analogous to that afforded by Dr. Robertson, and that I was very certain he could not find one—that, in my opinion, so far from having the right to be at large in the streets of Montreal, provoking irreproachable citizens to fight duels, Dr. Robertson's place ought to be within the four walls of a prison, awaiting the verdict of life or death from a Petit Jury—that he ought not to flatter himself that his trial was abandoned—that one day or other it would be commenced—that the greater part of the other magistrates who, on the 20th May, had decided, without the authority of the Returning Officer, that the troops should be called out on the 21st May, might pretend that they wished only to intimidate by the display of that force, without foreseeing that it would cause the massacre of citizens—but that Dr. Robertson had no such pitiable excuse—that he accompanied Mr. Nottatt on the eve of that butchery, to Colonel McIntosh's and that the latter had told them not to call out the troops until the last extremity, because, if they went out, men would inevitably be killed—that those two magistrates had taken upon themselves, after this warning, the responsibility of the events which followed, since they did not require, on the 21st May, a meeting of their brother magistrates to communicate this information to them, and to demand them to reflect upon the order of the preceding evening, and to decide whether they were willing or not to abide the consequences such as Colonel McIn-

tosh warned them of—that it was truly a hellish inspiration in a man, thirsting for the shedding of blood, to go under these circumstances to Colonel McIntosh, at the Place d'Armes, on several occasions, and to assure him that the Civil Authorities had received the most positive information that a plot was formed to set fire, at various points, to the town and suburbs, in order to draw the troops in squads to different parts and directions for the purpose of over-powering them—that the invention of the story of Montferand arriving with a calash load of axe-handles, to knock down Mr. Walker's partizans, was another recent lie on the part of a Magistrate who deliberated, the same night and following days, on the measures to be adopted for the safety of the town—when he was so violent a partizan. I added that it was nothing but the most revolting partiality that released, without bail, the military regularly accused of wilful murder, and that it was that partiality that had left the magistrate who had directed them, that liberty which he abused at present, instead of taking advantage of it to relieve of his presence that society which he had outraged by the assassination of three of his innocent fellow-citizens.

Mr. Bellingham persisted in saying that he only considered the private character of his friend. I replied that I had nothing to do with the Doctor's private character which I knew nothing of—that I judged and justly denounced him by the public acts of his public life. He said that if I did not attack his private character the affair may, though difficultly be arranged. I replied, that to me that was a matter of indifference; that the writings spoke for themselves, and that I believed myself perfectly justified in not replying to Dr. Robertson.

As for Mr. Walker, I added, besides what Mr. Holmes has reported, that the speeches of Mr. Walker and his friends in the Taverns, and the demonstrations of violence against my effigy, in the presence of a drunken mob, composed partly of strangers to the town, where they could commit the greatest crimes without the risk of being known, were provocatives to assassination. I said that their conduct had been the cause that I was obliged, from information of the most precise description which I received, to see my wife and my little ones flying for safety night after night from their house, where, had it not been for accidental circumstances, they would have been attacked—that his printed speeches were of such a character as to deprive him of the right of challenging me—that his writings did not offend me, because they contained nothing of truth against me—that after all his conduct, I would pay no attention to this challenge, and that if he gave publicity to his proceedings, the public would judge between him and me, and that I did not fear its judgment.

L. J. PAPINEAU.

Montreal, Dec. 8, 1834.