

have *proved* themselves the uncompromising supporters as well of the rights of the Crown as of the privileges of the people, as these are recognized and established under the British constitution, it is not at all necessary that I assert the individual disloyalty of Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Hincks, in order to prove that (influenced from without *as they are*), they are improper men to be entrusted with the power and patronage of the Government in a British Colony.

If my Lord John Russell lost (and his patriotism made his Lordship willing, for a time, to lose) the sweets of place and power, because a portion of his political allies had views and interests which were considered dangerous to the public ; because, in fact, his Lordship was in danger of being "*run away with*" by his extreme supporters ; and if against none of those, any charge could be made, of having individually bared his arm against his country, or of having refused to lift it up to defend his country against internal or external foes, why should Mr. Baldwin complain, if, more deserving it, he should share the fate of that great statesman, in being turned out of office ? I answer, fearlessly, that this arises from a cause which I am truly sorry to discover in Mr. Baldwin's character, viz., as total a want of practical patriotism as of every other manly practical quality of a statesman. Does Lord John Russell bear such allegiance to his party, that he would convulse his country to keep it in power, *though no great principle was at stake* ?

Of Mr. Baldwin's private feelings, I should wish to say nothing—or nothing offensive ; but knowing the *utter absence* of all fairness and generosity among his more immediate friends, I am quite aware of the fact, that I shall be most foully *misrepresented in my motives*, for exposing even his public character. My sense of duty to the public has, however, this assurance in overcoming my private feelings on the occasion of this explanation, that I know that I speak not only to a just but to a loyal public ; and that I know how exceedingly few and insignificant Mr. Baldwin's out and out supporters in Upper Canada *really are*, and how little the public have confidence in what they say or do, since most of them either rebelled against, or declined defending the Government in 1837. I have come forward, therefore, to *tell the truth about Mr. Baldwin's true and unvarnished position as a public man, or rather as a party man*. To the honour of the former name, his character *practically* does not aspire. It may be said, indeed, that "his character belongs to British America," in one sense. This, however, cannot be said in the sense of his being a fair representation of the principles and spirit of her Majesty's trans-Atlantic subjects, but merely because his name will be recorded in history as—

*"The mere accident of an accident !"*

That accident, has been nearly as fatal to Canada as to the Old Colonies, viz., the opposition to the *British* principle of Responsible Government, of the former Governing or High Church party, in all the old and present North American Colonies.

We *love* the British Government, not only because it is *British*, but because it is the freest and *best* government on earth ; not only because thinking so, our fathers fought and died to sustain its philanthropic principles, but because we, their sons, are prepared to do so, too, whether we find them openly assailed in the field, or betrayed by the Judas kiss of the colonial republican.