

Again, in no sense has the recent failure been more complete than in overlooking the establishment of free Governments, and the practical effects secured to the colonies. It has been forgotten that each is, in reality, independent, has its destiny in its own hands, its statesmen and people competent to judge of their interests, and of the course best calculated to secure or conciliate those interests. Let this position be compared with that occupied less than thirty years since. Then Lord John Russell or Earl Grey presided at the Colonial Office, and were able to enforce a policy long binding upon the statesmen subsequently in power. There was, however, a "Mr. Mother-Country," of whom there is little remembrance in this generation. He was the incarnation of centralized government, an irrepressible power in producing discontent and misrule in every colony. Without assuming the airs of dictation, "Mother-Country" ruled cabinets and senate; passed or vetoed Acts of Parliament; determined the course of public opinion, by publishing or withholding despatches. In him was vested the authority "to which was committed that last appeal from the Colonies themselves, which was dignified with all those vague phrases about the power, the honour, the supremacy, and the wisdom of the Mother-Country." This mysterious influence has lately been again introduced to the public by the *Times*. How few know anything of "Mother-Country!" And how carefully the editor wishes him avoided in this discussion! But to those who have to contrast the present condition of the Colonies with that of former days, the withdrawal of "Mr. Mother-Country" is sufficient to produce