

country, the number of highly respectable, intelligent and talented individuals, in short, of the aristocracy, must necessarily be few, and that, according to the maxim '*similis simili gaudet*,' it follows as a natural consequence, that nearly the whole should, in time, become 'connected,' either through matrimonial alliances or otherwise? Thank God we have not yet arrived at '*an age of reason*,' when, as in the bloody days of the French Revolution, rank, talent, virtue and modesty might be compelled, if not disposed, to intermarry and associate with vileness, ignorance, infamy and obscenity! Under the fostering protection of your Lordship and your party, a renewal of such *glorious times* might perhaps be confidently anticipated. Is it very extraordinary or very deplorable that "successive Governors" should, *unlike your Lordship*, have selected their advisers and their objects of patronage from the few who were most distinguished for rank, honour, integrity and intelligence, for of such does the "official party" whom you would stigmatize consist. Are "successive Governors" very culpable for manifesting such a preference? But then, your Lordship most lachrymously observes, the members of this "official party," this "family compact," are—"lamentabile dictu"—TORIES! "*Hinc illæ lachrymæ*;" had they been rabid radicals, or false-hearted traitors, like Rolph, "*the gentleman*" whose fortunate expulsion from the Executive Council you, apparently, most deeply deplore, "successive Governors" would probably have escaped your Lordship's discriminating denunciations, even though "the Bench, the Magistracy, the high offices of the Episcopal Church (perhaps you may wish these 'high offices' conferred upon radical dissenters) and a great part of the legal profession," *actually had been* "filled by the adherents of that party!"

My Lord, I am neither a member, nor the apologist, of