

strengthened by the perusal of the extracts from his letter addressed to Dr. O'Callaghan. This declaration I feel myself compelled to make in consequence of the publication of my private letter to Mr. Bidwell—the printing of which, however, I do not myself complain of, if placing it before the public has afforded any gratification to Mr. Bidwell or those interested in his welfare.

The next and the last time I saw Mr. Bidwell was, as he passed out of Government House after his interview with Sir Francis Head, and on which occasion he declared his intention to leave the Province for ever. I do not recollect that I at that time spoke to him or he to me—I think not—and I certainly was not aware of the nature of his conversation with Sir Francis Head until I was some short time afterwards told of it by His Excellency. The Correspondent of the Kingston Herald who signs himself “*A United Empire Loyalist*,” asserts that “Mr. Bidwell was morally and virtually compelled to leave the Province by Sir Francis Head”—and that he (Sir Francis) had “*robbed Mr. Bidwell of the rights and privileges of a British subject*.” And applies epithets to His Excellency personally, as well as to his public conduct, so offensive and unauthorised as very clearly to prove (in my opinion at least,) that he is far less the friend of Mr. Bidwell than the enemy of Sir Francis. Mr. Bidwell also in his letter of the 27th of December last, speaks of his “*banishment*,” which he says was “*cruel and unjust*”—and in his letter of the 12th April, he states he was “*compelled*” to leave the Province, and that Sir Francis had done him “*a great and cruel wrong*.”

Now I will merely ask any dispassionate man of ordinary understanding to peruse the two letters addressed to Sir Francis Head by Mr. Bidwell, the first dated at Toronto the 8th December, 1837.—the very day on which he determined on leaving the Province—and the second from Lewiston in the United States, on the 11th of the same month, and then ask himself upon what possible ground Mr. Bidwell could venture to make the assertions contained in the letters I have referred to! Mr. Bidwell is admitted on all hands to be a man of considerable talents, and that he well understands the meaning of the words he uses—he also is a cautious man, and is well known never to admit any thing in favour of a political opponent if he can avoid it,—unless, therefore, he be a dishonest or insincere man, he meant what he wrote when he addressed Sir Francis Head, the following letter:—

“*Toronto, 8th December, 1837.*”

“*Sir,—In consequence of the kind conversation of your Excellency this morning, I have determined to leave this Province for ever.*”

I am aware that the circumstances to which your Excellency alluded are calculated to give rise to suspicions against me in relation to this insurrection; and while they would be likely to render my further residence in this Province unpleasant, they make your Excellency's kindness the more worthy of my deep and lasting gratitude.

I am confident, at the same time, that the investigations which will now of course be made, will fully remove these suspicions from your Excellency's mind, and will disprove that any such attempt was in contemplation.

I have the honor to be, most respectfully, your Excellency's grateful servant.

(Signed) MARSHALL S. BIDWELL.
His Excellency Sir Francis Bond Head.”

Here we have the true reason of Mr. Bidwell's determination to leave the Province—the same reason that he gave to myself the day previous for desiring to remove to another country, viz.—That “*suspicious existed against him in relation to the insurrectionary movements which were likely to render his future residence in the Province unpleasant*.” Not one word or sentiment is to be traced in this letter that implies in the most remote degree, that Sir Francis Head desired *cruelly and unjustly to banish him*—how can Mr. Bidwell or his friend reconcile this after-thought—this utterly unfounded assertion with his admission that “*His Excellency's kindness was worthy of his deep and lasting gratitude?*” Were it not for his second letter dated Lewiston, the 11th December, Mr. Bidwell or his friends might pretend that he had been coerced into writing that of the 8th, but in this latter communication, when he was freed from all alarms—removed from all undue influence, he begins his letter by stating that he “*avails himself of the first leisure moment at his command, to repeat his acknowledgments for His Excellency's personal regard and good wishes during His Excellency's conversation with him on Friday*.” This letter contains other equally strong expressions of gratitude for the kind treatment he had experienced from Sir Francis Head; and although he states that Sir Francis intimated a wish that he should remove from the Province, he no where asserts or insinuates that he was coerced into leaving it. Repeating, therefore, what I have already stated, that Mr. Bidwell (being admitted to be a person of good understanding and ability) is either a man of truth and honesty or he is not—if he be a man of truth, then upon his own deliberate admission, *he was not banished from the Province*, but left it because his continuing to reside here would be *unpleasant*;—neither was he *cruelly or unjustly* treated by Sir Francis Head, but the very reverse—if he be not a man of truth or honesty, (which must be the case if he denies the truth of the admission made by him in his letter of the 8th and 11th December,) I take it for granted no person of respectability will feel much concern or interest about him.

There is another point of view in which it is proper that this case should be presented to the public, and it is this:—Assuming it to be true that Sir Francis Head, when he met Mr. Bidwell, told him that he was in possession of several letters addressed to him, which he had not opened; that he was suspected of being concerned in the rebellion, and that unless he agreed to leave the Province, his letters would be opened, and that he would be arrested in consequence of the suspicions entertained against him—what ought to have been, what would have been the answer of a man conscious of innocence and rectitude of conduct? Would he not have spurned the degrading proposal, and claimed, as a matter of right, an immediate and solemn investigation into his conduct? Would a man pure in his own mind and resolved on transmitting the inheritance of an honorable name and unblemished reputation to his children, consent to abandon the country in which he had lived from his infancy, rather than encounter a trial upon a false accusation of being a Traitor? It seems to me impossible—and I have never yet heard political friend or enemy of Mr. Bidwell, with the exception of “*A UNITED EMPIRE LOYALIST*” say, that they would believe that gentleman innocent, if they supposed he left the Province because he was