

safely be trusted with irresponsible powers. Europe had paid a terrible tribute in blood for the predominance of France, under Napoleon, and was it wonderful that the stupendous growth of your country should excite apprehension? Neither was your policy towards England before the war fitted to disarm this feeling. It was often subject of complaint that you treated us with less than justice; it was feared that you wished to humiliate us, and it was not unreasonably thought that a division of your country would protect us from an aggressive policy afterwards, and preserve for future ages that "balance of power," which Europe has esteemed the best security for international peace.

These considerations I venture to offer as a palliation—if not an excuse—for the unfavourable tone of a large part of the British public towards the North. But many of our leading men and many of our best papers were your staunch friends all through the war; little notice is taken of this in the North. The sympathies of such men as the Duke of Argyle, Messrs. Cobden and Bright, Messrs. Forster and Mill were well known to be on your side, and a large proportion of our people, especially among the working classes, went along with them. The party represented by these men now enjoys the supremacy in political power, and surely this fact smooths away the obstacles to a mutual *rapprochement*.

In conclusion I would say, "Let bye-gones be bye-gones;" let us bury our controversies in a friendly arbitration, and when the question is once settled, let the waters of Lethe flow over it; and when in future ages all passionate interest in the matter has ceased, the historian will exhume the controversy, and tell how two great and Christian nations once settled their disputes in harmony with the benign precepts of the religion they professed.

BRITANNICUS.