

mind of England were inimical to the Colonies—that separation was a foregone conclusion, dismemberment of empire a sentiment cherished, advocated, and promoted in every possible manner! The Earl of Carnarvon, with some leanings towards the recent agitation, mildly exposes the “misunderstandings,” asserting that those connected with some colonies “complained of a coldness,” while “gentlemen who represent other colonies said there was too much interference with them.” But this is too mild, for there was a thorough outspoken, undisguised determination to make the most of the doctrine of separation, it being carried to the length of, positively, almost wilfully misquoting, garbling, perverting the sense—often the words—of Lord Granville, and the officials at Downing Street. The fact can only be accounted for on the ground of injured pride or disappointed ambition, which had adopted the conviction of great services to be rendered where none, in fact, were wanted; of burning patriotism, glowing with laudable zeal for distant tribes and possessions when there was no grievance to redress, no injustice to remedy, no reform to accomplish. It would now serve no good purpose to collate the speeches in order to weed out inflammatory sentiments or revolutionary doctrines; but there were orations fit for the Fenian brotherhood, while pamphlets, articles in newspapers, and essays in magazines have abounded with passion, and prejudice, and party spirit, to excite hostility and satisfy personal revenge. It is gratifying to know that the wisdom of Parliament will dispel the illusions about “disintegration,” if any have been created,—indeed the House of Lords has