



# Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION







012  
/5.

.100.27 x .96.

# IMPERIAL FEDERATION

LONDON: PRINTED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE  
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

# IMPERIAL FEDERATION

OF

## GREAT BRITAIN

AND

## HER COLONIES

IN LETTERS EDITED BY

### FREDERICK YOUNG

(ONE OF THE WRITERS)



LONDON

S. W. SILVER AND CO., CORNHILL

1876

*(All rights reserved)*

226. i. 460





TO  
THE BRITISH PEOPLE  
'AT HOME' AND 'BEYOND THE SEAS'

THIS VOLUME, which is intended to bring to the earnest consideration of the wise and thoughtful among them the means by which, under the blessing of Almighty God, the permanent Unity of the Empire may be preserved, to the benefit and advantage of all who acknowledge the British sway, and for the advancement of progress and civilisation throughout the world, is, with feelings of the warmest sympathy, dedicated by their fellow-countryman

*FREDERICK YOUNG.*



## INTRODUCTION.

---

EXACTLY one hundred years ago a memorable historical event took place. On the 4th of July 1776 the Congress of the United States adopted their famous 'Declaration of Independence,' and the bond between Great Britain and her American colonies was broken for ever.

Had wiser counsels prevailed in the mother-country, this step might never have been taken by the most important and flourishing part of her Colonial Empire, and she might have been spared years of internecine strife and bloodshed, and of humiliating and hopeless warfare, in her vain attempt to reduce her rebellious Transatlantic citizens to an allegiance, they then solemnly, and emphatically repudiated.

It was a period of great sorrow in England, and of great joy in America. The crushing defeat inflicted upon her, caused the deepest disappointment and chagrin to the former; while, to the latter, the complete victory gained by her successful colonists, was the source of enthusiastic jubilation and just pride.

From this struggle, and from its disastrous result, England has learnt a lesson she never will forget.

Deprived, as she was, of the best and most prosperous of her colonies, it might have been thought she never could recover from the effects of such a blow. But destined to become, some day, greater and more illustrious as a Colonial Power than ever, although shaken to her very foundations by the tremendous loss to her prestige she had sustained, she speedily rallied under it.

Her great colony of Canada, developed, in our own day, into a splendid and powerful Dominion, continued true to her, and resisted

every overture to abandon the old and honoured flag.

The Cape, and the other colonies of the Crown also, still remained to her, to become in the present century the germs of a Colonial Empire, unparalleled in ancient, or modern history.

It seems the mission of Great Britain to be, by the Providence of God, the principal colonising country of the world. With sublime courage and most devoted zeal, her noble army of missionaries are ever going forth, with the Bible in their hands, penetrating into new regions at the peril of their lives, to preach the gospel of their Divine Master to the heathen, and spread the knowledge of Christian civilisation among the savage tribes of every clime. Quickly following their footsteps, multitudes of adventurous Englishmen, with indomitable energy and enterprise, are bent on developing the natural resources of each new country, as it becomes

known, and opening up to the undeniable, and incalculable benefits of trade, and commerce, the primeval wilderness of many a lovely land.

In this way Great Britain, since she lost America, has added to her territories the vast and magnificent continent of Australia, and the rich and beautiful islands of New Zealand; and she is rapidly pouring into them, as well as into her older colonies of Canada and the Cape, an intelligent and energetic population.

But, while all these great communities of Canada, the Cape, Australia, and New Zealand—each the nascent nation of a not very far off future—are thus becoming so marvellously developed, the pressing question is fast ripening for solution, as to what are to be the conditions of their future political relationship to Great Britain.

Originally sprung from her, speaking her language, owning allegiance to the same monarch, governed by the same constitutional laws, they

are bound to her by the closest ties of sentiment, and of interest.

The time, however, will soon come, when the days of their apprenticeship will be over, and when all the control, still exercised by the mother-country, must cease, and then the crucial question, involving issues of the most momentous character, must be solved.

If entire independence of her was ever desired, or demanded by any of her colonies, this country would not repeat the fatal mistake she committed in the case of America. Of that we may be sure. It is not in this direction that there is any chance of her policy being as erroneous as before. There is another danger, however, arising from the frame of mind of many of those who direct the national policy, to which England is peculiarly prone. It is this: there is a fear lest, from a careless disregard of their priceless value to her as supports and bulwarks to her Empire, and the inestimable benefits they confer upon her in



adding to her strength and power, from the enormous amount of material wealth they pour into her lap ; and frequently from a supine and selfish indifference to the sentimental feelings of their fellow-countrymen in the colonies—their co-equals in every respect—the people of England may be inattentive to their just expectations and natural sensibilities, and unconsciously *let them slide*.

Thus it may come to pass, that they might be led to regard absolute independence of her, as being a necessary, and the only ultimate result, simply because the mother-country had never encouraged them to believe there was any other way of their participating in the privileges and power of a complete autonomic nationality.

Let me put the question frankly.

At a certain stage of their growth, one of two alternatives must happen with all the great self-governing colonies of Great Britain—‘*Fede-*

*ration*’ or ‘*Disintegration.*’ And why not the former? I ask; or why should we be compelled to contemplate the latter, as inevitable?

To solve a question of such delicacy, difficulty, and grandeur, demands, no doubt, the exercise of the highest political sagacity and profound statesmanship, the purest patriotism, and the most unprejudiced and unselfish disposition to act only for the common weal.

Are these qualities not to be found among a people, owning the same origin, speaking the same language, professing the same sentiments of civil and religious liberty, and with a history, possessing such great and glorious associations as our own?

A few years ago, the symptoms of the growing prevalence, among a certain class of leading politicians in this country, of opinions in favour of disintegration, at length roused to energetic action a number of influential men, animated by a loftier and more generous spirit, who were closely

connected with, and deeply interested in, the welfare of the colonies. Among them the names of Edward Wilson, and James Youl stand conspicuous.

Assembling together, they sounded the tocsin of alarm at the spread of these pernicious ideas and narrow views, and boldly appealed to all, who felt as they did, to make an emphatic protest against them. It was thus, that the memorable meetings, which were held in the heart of the City of London, at the Cannon Street Hotel, in the year 1869, became the signal for the 'turning of the tide.' The success of these meetings was most remarkable. They seemed at once to touch the springs of national feeling, and elicited in an unmistakable manner from a most influential and powerful section of English society a thoroughly sympathetic colonial sentiment. From that time the attitude of the Government of this country began to change. A wiser and more patriotic

policy prevailed. No longer was heard, as before—excepting an occasional suppressed murmur, like the rumblings of distant thunder, from a few of those who most reluctantly resigned their favourite dogmas—anything in favour of disintegration.

Public attention was still further kept alive to the sentiments promoted by the Cannon Street meetings, by the ‘Conferences on Colonial Questions,’ which were held at the Westminster Palace Hotel in the month of July 1871. A full account of these interesting, and important gatherings, forming a valuable contribution to the history of a movement, fraught with such great results, was afterwards published.<sup>1</sup>

At this period many staunch Federationists did good service in the heroic cause. During the Social Science Meeting at Bristol in 1869, papers, touching on the general subject of Federation, were read by Messrs. Gorst, Hare, Noble, Macfie,

<sup>1</sup> See ‘Discussions on Colonial Questions.’ Strahan & Co.

and Labilliere. In January 1871 the keynote of 'Imperial' Federation was first sounded by Mr. Edward Jenkins, M.P., in an article of great ability, under this title, in the 'Contemporary Review.' This was followed by equally able, and argumentative papers from himself, and from Mr. Labilliere on the same subject, at the Westminster Conferences in July 1871, and at the Social Science Congress at Devonport in October 1872.

Imperial Federation was again brought before public notice by the late estimable and talented Mr. Eddy, at the Social Science Meeting held at Glasgow in October 1874, in a paper, which was also subsequently read, after his death, at the Royal Colonial Institute; and by Mr. Labilliere in his admirable and successful paper, read before the same Society in January 1875, 'On the Permanent Unity of the Empire.'

*The Colonies*, a newspaper advocating very powerfully the best and most important in-

terests of the Colonial Empire, has more than once lent its columns to the ventilation of the great, and vital question of Imperial Federation. An able correspondence appeared in it on the subject, in the months of January, February, and March 1873, by 'Philo Colonus' and 'H. de B. H.,' in which the possibilities of the formation of a great British Union are very vigorously and elaborately discussed.<sup>1</sup>

Imperial Federationists continued, however, to be challenged by their opponents with not having any exact or definite plan for carrying out their ideas.

In consequence of this, it was determined in the month of November last by the conductors of that journal, that the columns of *The Colonies* should be again thrown open to a further discussion of the subject; and I was honoured by being invited to commence the correspondence, which has since been so spiritedly

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix.

carried on for several months, by letters from the Duke of Manchester, the Hon. Wm. Fox, Mr. Labilliere, 'Colonus,' 'Imperialist,' and 'A Constant Reader,' and which was recently terminated, as it had been begun, by myself.

These letters are now published in a complete form in the present volume. They may not unreasonably be considered to comprise a valuable addition to what has previously been brought forward on this subject. They contain a tolerably clear and correct outline of the prevailing ideas, which are entertained by the various writers on a question, than which there is none more serious and profound in connection with the future destinies of the whole British Empire.

To my intelligent and thoughtful fellow-countrymen, in this country, and Transatlantic and Antipodean alike—to Englishmen at home, as well as 'beyond the seas'—I make an earnest appeal, that these letters may be carefully and attentively read; that the arguments put forward

on behalf of Imperial Federation may be fairly and temperately weighed; that they may be judged without passion or prejudice; and that they may be patiently, unselfishly, and patriotically thought out. The question here presented to every unprejudiced British mind is this, that the only real way of obtaining the inestimable national blessing of 'Imperial Federation,' will be, by the national possession, some day, of an 'Imperial Parliament' or 'Senate.'

The urgent necessity for such a Parliament for the whole nation is being forcibly shown at the very moment this volume is passing through the press. Two most important colonial questions are now under discussion in the 'British' Parliament—often most inaptly and inaccurately called, both by legislators and public writers, 'Imperial.' One is the 'Colonial Marriage,' and the other the 'Merchant Shipping Bill.' Here are two questions of supreme social and commercial importance to



the great self-governing colonies of Australasia and Canada, being dealt with, and legislated upon by a British Parliament, in which there is no direct colonial representative element at all. Is it likely that a state of things, so seriously unsatisfactory and so utterly anomalous, can much longer continue? Let us, then, neither be daunted by any apparent difficulties, nor allow superficial obstacles, springing from jealousy, or inability to embrace at once all the details of a grand and comprehensive idea of the highest good to the whole nation, to be sufficient to condemn it, as chimerical, or to put it aside, as Utopian and impossible. In the simple but forcible language of one of the writers of the letters now published,—the Hon. Mr. Fox, the late Premier of New Zealand—I would say, ‘If it is the right thing to be done, there must be some conceivable way of doing it.’

F. Y.

5 QUEENSBERRY PLACE, S.W.

*July 1876.*

# CONTENTS.



## LETTER I.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

	PAGE
Question opened—Mr. W. E. Forster at Edinburgh—Colonies regarded as parts of England—Influence of Sentiment in the Government of Nations—Power of Sympathy and Self-interest—Danger of Distance in weakening sympathetic ties—How this is to be arrested—English History appealed to—Origin of English Parliaments cited—Colonies and Counties—An Imperial Parliament or Senate should be formed to deal with Imperial Questions—Local Parliaments to manage Local Affairs—Bold Proposal—The people of the Colonies and Mother-Country compared—How alone England's future greatness can be preserved . . . . .	1

## LETTER II.

*From the* HON. WILLIAM FOX  
*(late Premier of New Zealand).*

National Character coloured by Sentiment—Colonies entitled to feel themselves integral portions of a <u>great Nation, and to share in the historic greatness of the Empire</u> —Neglect of the Imperial Government to promote Colonisation on true principles—For two centuries past allowed to drift—Objection to the Colonies being regarded as extensions of the Empire in the same way as English Counties—Change proposed by Mr. Young discussed—Not merely revolutionary, but a Revolution—Task a 'big' one—Hope expressed that it is not insuperable—Support to it promised . . . . .	5
--	---

## LETTER III.

*From FRANCIS P. LABILLIERE.*

	PAGE
Permanent Union of the Colonies with the Mother-Country a question eminently practical—Idea of Federal Government not a new one—Obstacles to its creation arising from distance and Parliamentary pride—Proposal that the English Parliament should give up Imperial Questions to Federal Parliament—Representatives for the Lower House—Plan for an Upper House—Colonial Senators and Imperial Senate—Cabinet Ministers requiring to be changed—Difficulties of British Federation less than those of the Germans and Americans—Time for it not yet arrived—Necessity of being prepared for it . . .	9

## LETTER IV.

*From FREDERICK YOUNG.*

Importance of Imperial Federation—Value of Mr. Fox's adhesion to the principle—Defence of suggestion that the Colonies should be regarded as extensions of the Old Country—Parallel derived from English History—Central Parliament not to administer the Local Affairs of the Subdivisions of the Empire—Does the idea propound an Old or New principle?—There are 'Revolutions' and 'Revolutions'—Mission of Great Britain to be the great Civiliser of Mankind—Irresistible power created by a permanent Union of the Empire . . . . .	16
---	----

## LETTER V.

*From the HON. WILLIAM FOX.*

Proposal involves a substantial change in the Constitution of Parliament—Colonial Representation not feasible at present—Mass of work undertaken by the English Parliament for every local emergency—Local matters ought to be handed over to Local Parliaments—A great Imperial Parliament not a new idea—Mr. Cobden—Mr. Trevelyan's County Household Suffrage—Professor Newman—Practical impediments to the introduction of Colonial Representatives into the British Parliament—New Zealand Constitution criticised . . .	21
--	----

## LETTER VI.

*From the* DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

	PAGE
Colonies entitled to a share in directing the Policy of the Empire when their interests are affected; to be accomplished by inaugurating a New Chamber in which the United Kingdom and Colonies should be represented in due proportions—Privy Council Scheme—Colonial Representatives in the House of Commons—Both equally objectionable—Power to tax for Imperial, not Local purposes . . . . .	26

## LETTER VII.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

Duke of Manchester—Colonial Representatives in English Parliament—New Imperial Parliament—Comprehensive Scheme of Federation—Lord Derby at Edinburgh—Change of Colonial Policy extraordinary—Dreamers and Doctrinaires—Inexpediency of giving details of any plan of Imperial Federation—Necessary to look forward—Federation already thought of in the Colonies—Ultimate grand ideal suggested . . . . .	29
---	----

## LETTER VIII.

*From the* HON. WILLIAM FOX.

Agreement with Mr. Young—Views identical—Both believe that Federation would be a good thing—Duke of Manchester's Council of Advice—Colonists would not agree to it—Fundamental Change in the character of Parliament necessary to prepare the way for Federation . . . . .	34
--	----

## LETTER IX.

*From* 'COLONUS.'

Idea of Federation admirable, but not practicable—No Colony has asked for it—Imperial subjects limited— <i>Cui Bono</i> —'Twice in a Century'—Merits of a Council of Advice—Aids and Checks to Colonial Office—'Something might grow out of this'—Elective element desirable—Danger of Local jealousies . . . . .	36
---	----

## LETTER X.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

	PAGE
Colonies as Counties again defended—Equality of Imperial Partnership — Anonymous Correspondent—Peace and War and Postal Com- munication—Contracted views of 'Colonus'—Interest of England and her Colonies identical—Council of advice a complete failure— Details of any plan of Imperial Federation declined—Statesmanship and Patriotism—The framing of Constitutions fitted to endure, a question of the future . . . . .	39

## LETTER XI.

*From* 'COLONUS.'

Federation of adjacent Colonies—Competition—Rival Schemes—Rail- ways and Telegraph Lines—Immigration—Protection and Free Trade —Difficulties of Colonial Legislation—Sir W. F. Stawell on Federa- tion . . . . .	45
---	----

## LETTER XII.

*From* 'COLONUS'

Voltaire—No difference between Mr. Fox and 'Colonus'—Imperial Federation admirable if practicable—Sir Thomas More's Utopia— British Parliament and Federal 'Council'—Foreign War and Postal Communication—Two Ministries—Home Rule—Is India to be repre- sented ? . . . . .	48
---	----

## LETTER XIII.

*From* 'AN IMPERIALIST.'

National Feeling aroused—A great Empire—Suez Canal—The history of England a noble one—Real relation of the Colonies and the Mother- Country—Revolution of feeling—Moral force—Federation movement advancing in the Colonies—A grander Federation still—Time not come for devising exact plan—Influence of a great war—Size a promoter of unity—How the supreme problem is to be solved . . .	52
---	----

## LETTER XIV.

*From the* DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

	PAGE
India and representation for British race only—What work the Federal Council is to do—Relations of Ministers—Distinct Departments—Some responsible to Parliament of the United Kingdom, others to Federal Council . . . . .	58

## LETTER XV.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

Momentous issues of Imperial Federation—A <i>nom de plume</i> —Lord Anson—Agreement between ‘Colonus,’ Mr. Fox, and Mr. Young—Imperial Parliament and not a ‘Federal Council’—Questions it is to deal with—Letter of ‘Imperialist’—Statesmanlike Sentiments—Complete reply to ‘Colonus’ . . . . .	61
---	----

## LETTER XVI.

*From* ‘A CONSTANT READER.’

‘Colonus’ and the Discussion—Its rise and progress—Professor Goldwin Smith—Troubles in New Zealand—Erroneous use of the word ‘Council,’ instead of ‘Federal Parliament’—Edward Wilson—Cannon Street Meetings, and Westminster Conference—E. Jenkins, M.P.—F. P. Labilliere—‘Empire’ or ‘No Empire’—Letters of ‘Philo-Colonus’ and ‘H. de B. H.’—Mr. Young and Mr. Fox—Misconception of ‘Colonus’—Irish Home Rule not necessary—Imperium in Imperio <i>versus</i> the history of Federal Government . . . . .	66
--	----

## LETTER XVII.

*From* ‘COLONUS.’

Mr. Young and banter—Principle or Details, which first?—Powers of Imperial Parliament, or Federal Council—Volunteer Forces—Sydney Harbour—‘Cerberus’ at Melbourne—Taxes and Tariffs	
---	--

	PAGE
—Australia removed from all chance of Invasion—Colonial Parliaments and fresh taxation—What kind of Representatives would the Colonies send?—Candour and courtesy of the Duke of Manchester . . .	73

## LETTER XVIII.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

Common basis with 'Colonus' impossible—Reason for primary recognition of principle—Wide difference between Federal Council and Imperial Parliament—No Surrender proposed of Colonial Powers—Perfect equality between Colonies and Empire at home contended for—Australia and her risk of Invasion—'Colonus' on Colonial Representatives answered . . . . .	78
--	----

## LETTER XIX.

*From* 'COLONUS.'

The Duke of Manchester and subjects for the Federal Council—Definition of 'A Constant Reader'—E. G. Wakefield's 'Art of Colonisation'—Peace and War, and Foreign Treaties—Motives of men to enter public life—Imperial Government ought to be superior to English Government—Unnatural arrangement—Foreign Secretary—Taxing powers—Complication of divided responsibility—Suez Canal—Royal Titles Bill—Two Budgets—No analogy in history for such a system of Federal Government . . . . .	84
--	----

## LETTER XX.

*From* 'A CONSTANT READER.'

Unsubstantial apprehensions of 'Colonus'—Subject of Federation treated at length—Confusion of ideas—Wrong names—Great inaccuracy—Royal Colonial Institute—History of Confederation not studied by 'Colonus'—Possible and impossible Systems—Repudiation of Federal Council—Hope Mr. Young will rest satisfied . . . . .	94
---	----

## LETTER XXI.

*From 'COLONUS.'*

	PAGE
Difference with Mr. Young—Vital Principles—Power of Public Opinion—Examples of the United States cited—Old Countries and new Colonies—Efficient Agents—Mr. Childers and Mr. Jenkins—How are Members to be elected to the Federal Council?—'Stone-wall' at Melbourne—Mr. Berry and Sir Jas. McCulloch—Disgraceful Scenes in the House—With a legal, the Federal Council would have no real power—Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—North American Fisheries—Nice Embroglio . . . . .	100

## LETTER XXII.

*From the DUKE OF MANCHESTER.*

Hope to see an Imperial Parliament established—Federal Council similar to the Indian Council—The way to it—The Authority acquired by power of voting Money—Special Taxes to be levied from the whole Empire—Required amount to be raised by each State, as is found most convenient . . . . .	105
---	-----

## LETTER XXIII.

*From 'COLONUS.'*

Apology for irregular mode of treating the question—Several Correspondents to answer—'Eight' positions proved—Confederation of groups of Colonies a step towards a Confederation of the Empire—Might be a step towards disruption—Consultative Council of Advice recommended—Conclusion . . . . .	106
---	-----

## LETTER XXIV.

*From FREDERICK YOUNG.*

Expedient that the present Discussion should end—'Six' arguments in favour of Imperial Federation summarised—Discursive style of 'Colonus'—Able replies from the Duke of Manchester, Mr. Fox, Mr.	
---	--



	PAGE
Labilliere—'Imperialist' and 'A Constant Reader'—Diplomatic Appointments of the United States—Federation, or Disintegration, the alternative of the future—Emphatic protest against the use of the term Federal Council—Question should be discussed calmly, dispassionately, and without prejudice—The old, old Flag an Emblem for all time of the United British Empire . . . . .	111

---

## APPENDIX.

### No. I.

Letter from 'Philo-Colonus,' published in 'The Colonies' of January 16, 1873 . . . . .	119
--	-----

### No. II.

Letter from 'H. de B. H.,' in 'The Colonies' of January 24, 1873 . . . . .	124
--	-----

### No. III.

Letter from 'Philo-Colonus,' in 'The Colonies' of February 15, 1873 . . . . .	127
---	-----

### No. IV.

Letter from 'H. de B. H.' in 'The Colonies,' February 21, 1873 . . . . .	132
--	-----

### No. V.

Letter from 'F. R. G. S.' in 'The Colonies,' March 15, 1873 . . . . .	138
---	-----

### No. VI.

Leader in 'The Colonies,' April 1, 1873 . . . . .	144
---	-----

### No. VII.

'A Colony and Parliament.' Leader in 'The Colonies,' June 26, 1874 . . . . .	151
--	-----

### No. VIII.

Sir Julius Vogel. From the 'Standard,' October 10, 1874 . . . . .	157
---	-----

CONTENTS.

xxix

No. IX.

Empire or no Empire? A review in 'The Colonies,' January 16, 1873. PAGE  
157

No. X.

The British Empire. Leader in 'The Colonies,' November 27, 1875. 163

No. XI.

Imperial Confederation. Leader in 'The Colonies,' November 27, 1875. 168

No XII.

Colonists as fellow-countrymen. Letter signed 'A Pariah' in 'The Colonies,' November 27, 1875 . . . . . 173

No. XIII.


Colonial Governors and Colonial Federation. Leader in 'The Times,' May 1, 1875 . . . . . 177

No. XIV.

The Colonies in time of War. Letter from Mr. H. B. T. Strangways, to the Right Hon. B. Disraeli, M.P. From the 'Edinburgh Courant' 181



# IMPERIAL FEDERATION.



## LETTER I.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

QUESTION OPENED—MR. W. E. FORSTER AT EDINBURGH—COLONIES REGARDED AS PARTS OF ENGLAND—INFLUENCE OF SENTIMENT IN THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONS—POWER OF SYMPATHY AND SELF-INTEREST—DANGER OF DISTANCE IN WEAKENING SYMPATHETIC TIES—HOW THIS IS TO BE ARRESTED—ENGLISH HISTORY APPEALED TO—ORIGIN OF ENGLISH PARLIAMENTS CITED—COLONIES AND COUNTIES—AN IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT OR SENATE SHOULD BE FORMED TO DEAL WITH IMPERIAL QUESTIONS—LOCAL PARLIAMENTS TO MANAGE LOCAL AFFAIRS—BOLD PROPOSAL—THE PEOPLE OF THE COLONIES AND MOTHER-COUNTRY COMPARED—HOW ALONE ENGLAND'S FUTURE GREATNESS CAN BE PRESERVED.

THE question of what are the best means for promoting and ensuring the permanent union of the British Empire has received a new impulse in the recent address of Mr. W. E. Forster at Edinburgh.

In that masterly essay, the right honourable gentleman gave his unqualified adhesion to this noble and patriotic sentiment, which ought to find equal favour with every Briton, whether he happens to be born and bred in England itself, or is an inhabitant of the Empire at the Antipodes.

The Colonies of England—those mighty offshoots of an illustrious parentage ; the chief sources of her increasing wealth, as they are the powerful representatives of her greatness and glory—should be regarded merely as extensions of the area of the old country, and not as the foundations of new ones, which are destined to flourish under another flag.

Spreading, as the Empire now does, over every part of the habitable globe, it is a matter of the deepest and most vital concern to enquire by what means its permanent union may be most effectually guaranteed.

Sympathy is a bond which will no doubt have its effect in tending to keep alive a spirit of union between the widely-scattered portions of the British Empire. But although it would be impossible to ignore sentimental feelings, or to forget the real and ruling power of sentiment as a universal attribute of humanity, perceptibly influencing the government of nations, there is also another quality which operates almost perhaps as powerfully, and that is 'self-interest.'

The danger is that, in the more distant parts from the centre of a great Empire, sympathy may wax colder, and crude notions of apparent self-interest may prevail which are opposed to continued union, and which may lead ultimately to a desire for separation. How can this disintegrating feeling be arrested? It is the contention of those who wish the continuance of the union that no necessity whatever exists for its termination, either immediate or remote. Let us refer to the history of England to support this view. If we glance for a moment at its earliest

times, and bear in mind the origin of the union of the different parts of this country under Alfred the Great,—which were in fact in point of communication with one another far more remote than the Australias from England in the present day—we shall see the source from which our early Parliaments were afterwards constituted, by sending representatives from all these remote places to London as a centre. In this process, followed without interruption for more than six hundred years, we have at once the model and example to be followed now, in order to bind the whole Empire into an homogeneous and indissoluble union. Why should the Australasian group, the Cape, and the Dominion of Canada not be regarded as an extension of the counties of England, sending their proper proportion of representatives, just as Middlesex and Yorkshire, Cornwall or Northumberland, to the British Parliament? Undoubtedly, the Parliament of the future would have to be constructed on an entirely new basis. The Imperial Assembly would be formed to deal alone with Imperial questions—namely, those affecting the interests of the whole Empire, such as treaties with foreign countries, or defence, or peace and war, &c. The Foreign and Colonial Ministers, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be chosen from the Imperial Assembly, while probably Ministers like the Home Secretary and the President of the Board of Trade would be selected, as a separate Cabinet for domestic affairs, from such a Parliament as we now have, and which would, like the Parliaments of the various Colonies, only deal with local laws and home administrations, English, Irish, and Scotch.

No doubt all this involves a radical reconstruction of the Imperial representative body; but it is only the extension to every part of the Empire of the system already cited, which was inaugurated in the early period of our history, when England had no Colonies, and when it was more difficult to hold communication with the distant parts of our island than it is now with the most remote regions of her Colonial Empire. Such a proposal will be deemed a very bold, not to say chimerical, one by those who have been accustomed to regard these matters from the old-fashioned insular point of view only, and looked at English influence and supremacy as emanating alone from within the boundaries of the old country. They fail to recognise the noble and true, and far more thoroughly English idea, that every part of the Empire, however widely it extends, is filled with her sons, as brave, as intelligent, as patriotic, and as loyal as those at home, who are capable of adding fresh strength and vigour and support to the mother-country, as they increase in wealth and population, and who ought therefore to be regarded as part and parcel of herself, with all the rights and representative privileges she can give them, wherever, within the borders of her vast realm, they may be.

If we think the greatness and glory of England are worth preserving, we must extend our vision beyond the narrow limits of its affairs merely of to-day, and keep stedfastly in mind what are likely to be its destinies in the future, and frame a policy in consonance with its interests accordingly.

*November 24, 1875.*

## LETTER II.

*From the Hon. WILLIAM FOX  
(late Premier of New Zealand).*

NATIONAL CHARACTER COLOURED BY SENTIMENT—COLONIES ENTITLED TO FEEL THEMSELVES INTEGRAL PORTIONS OF A GREAT NATION, AND TO SHARE IN THE HISTORIC GREATNESS OF THE EMPIRE—NEGLECT OF THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT TO PROMOTE COLONISATION ON TRUE PRINCIPLES—FOR TWO CENTURIES PAST ALLOWED TO DRIFT—OBJECTION TO THE COLONIES BEING REGARDED AS EXTENSIONS OF THE EMPIRE IN THE SAME WAY AS ENGLISH COUNTIES—CHANGE PROPOSED BY MR. YOUNG DISCUSSED—NOT MERELY REVOLUTIONARY, BUT A REVOLUTION—TASK A 'BIG' ONE—HOPE EXPRESSED THAT IT IS NOT INSUPERABLE—SUPPORT TO IT PROMISED.

NATIONAL character, in my humble opinion, is coloured quite as much by sentiment as by laws and constitutions. But sentiment may be created or maintained by these, and it is on that account more than on account of any material advantages the Colonies are likely to derive from Federalisation, that the subject is of importance to them. It is of the highest importance to colonial character that our Colonies should feel themselves to be integral portions of a great nation, not mere dependencies and offshoots; that they should feel themselves entitled to share in the historic greatness of the Empire, past and contemporary, and not limit their sentiment to the comparatively petty parochial scope of their own narrow



existence. It seems to me equally important that the sentiment of the parent State should be expanded to the idea that the Colonies are limbs of her body, and not mere seedling plants, the offspring of casual winds and waves, which have carried these germs of new nations to distant soils, where they have taken accidental root—a process which, I am sorry to say, too nearly describes colonisation, as allowed to drift by the Imperial Government for some two centuries past. Our colonial portion of the Empire might have been far more developed and had far fewer difficulties to struggle with in infancy if the Imperial Government had understood that colonisation was a national function, and one of which Government should undertake the initiative.

It is a humiliating spectacle, when a desire has sprung up among individuals to annex a new province and plant a new colony, to see the professedly colonising branch of the Imperial Government halting and hesitating, and not knowing what to do, except threaten individual enterprise with future confiscation of land titles, if it dare to anticipate the action of this office, *which action never voluntarily comes*. I can remember how a precisely similar course of action impeded colonisation in New Zealand thirty-five years ago, and it is melancholy to see history reproducing itself from Colonial Office pigeon-holes when an analogous case occurs.

However, I took up my pen to touch upon the question of Federalisation, not New Guinea. I regard the proposal to Federalise as valuable, because it tends to create an Imperial sentiment on both sides, and I censure the

attitude of the Imperial Government, because it tends to check such sentiment. But now as regards the practicability of this Federalisation, which has hitherto been left out of the colonising idea.

Mr. Young's postulate that the Colonies ought to be regarded as extensions of the rest of the Empire in the same sense as the States of the Heptarchy were, and the counties of Middlesex, Yorkshire, Cornwall, and Northumberland are, is a dangerous one to rest the case of the Colonies upon. It involves the right of the central Parliament to tax and administer the local affairs of the subdivisions, and it is because of the existence of that Parliamentary right, that the subdivisions claim the privilege of representation. Practically the Colonies could never consent to exchange for Parliamentary representation, independent control of local affairs, nor would the Parliament of the parent State permit the interference of Colonial members with the affairs of that portion of the Empire resident within the four seas. Take, for instance, the single subject of Church Establishment or Disestablishment. The Colonies would never allow a majority of the Imperial Parliament to force Establishments upon them. On the other hand, the residents in Great Britain would not consent to Disestablishment by a majority obtained by an influx of Colonial votes. A hundred analogous cases might be suggested.

Mr. Young, however, sees this, and proposes a fundamental and entire change in the British Constitution to meet it: the creation of a Federal Parliament, to which should be reserved all matters of a character

purely Federal in the enlarged idea of Empire. This involves an immense change in the form of the British Constitution, in practice, if not in theory. I cannot agree with you in your comments on Mr. Young's letter, when you say, that it is open to Imperial Federalists like Mr. Young 'to disclaim all idea of inventing any new form of government.' Practically, the change would be an entirely new invention: it would amount to a complete reversal of things Parliamentary, as they are, and the adoption of an entirely different system of local self-government for the domestic portion of the Empire. It would be not merely revolutionary, but a revolution, more complete, extensive, and deep penetrating than that of 1688, or perhaps any other in British history. To such a revolution there may be no objection; it may be the solution of a vast accumulation of hitherto insolvable problems, and a practical discovery as great as Galileo's. But I would observe that it differs most materially from all propositions for Federalisation, which have hitherto emanated from the Colonies, and the friends of the Colonies. These have, as far as I have observed, gone no further than attempts to make colonial representation fit in with things as they are. Mr. Young and yourself, if I understand you rightly, propose so to alter existing things, as to make them fit in with colonial representation. Well, you have set yourself a 'big' task—I will hope not an insuperable one. I should be glad if any humble aid of mine could help you in it; and if I do not unduly intrude upon your space, will in a future number continue my remarks.

*December 7.*

## LETTER III.

*From* FRANCIS P. LABILLIERE.

PERMANENT UNION OF THE COLONIES WITH THE MOTHER-COUNTRY  
 A QUESTION EMINENTLY PRACTICAL—IDEA OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NOT A NEW ONE—OBSTACLES TO ITS CREATION ARISING FROM DISTANCE AND PARLIAMENTARY PRIDE—PROPOSAL THAT THE ENGLISH PARLIAMENT SHOULD GIVE UP IMPERIAL QUESTIONS TO FEDERAL PARLIAMENT—REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE LOWER HOUSE—PLAN FOR AN UPPER HOUSE—COLONIAL SENATORS AND IMPERIAL SENATE—CABINET MINISTERS REQUIRING TO BE CHANGED—DIFFICULTIES OF BRITISH FEDERATION LESS THAN THOSE OF THE GERMANS AND AMERICANS—TIME FOR IT NOT YET ARRIVED—NECESSITY OF BEING PREPARED FOR IT.

I BELIEVE you can do no better service to the Imperial cause than by occasionally affording facilities for the discussion of the future constitution which will be required to maintain the permanent unity of the Empire. From passing events, which afford such abundant materials for the purpose, you constantly illustrate the value of the union and the importance of rendering it indissoluble; but many long-sighted people naturally ask, what is ultimately to come of all this? How are the Colonies to be kept in union with the mother-country, when they attain greater maturity of growth, and possess largely increased populations? The question is eminently practical; and to charge those who attempt to answer, by giving a

sketch of any forms of Federal union, with being impracticable dreamers, and theorists, is to display an utter thoughtlessness or incapacity to comprehend the nature of such a great question.

I know that the materials for the formation of such a Confederate system, as I propose to sketch, do not yet exist, though they are fast growing; but I believe it is desirable, that Imperial Federalists should meet the challenges of foes and the fears of friends by occasionally producing their plans, and by endeavouring to familiarise our people with something of the shape which any effective organisation of our Empire must eventually assume.

We are not, as you point out in your last issue, dealing with a speculation, but with an existing and well-defined form of government, and the only question is as to its capacity for expansion to supply our future Imperial requirements. Some people assert that no plan of political union has been propounded, just as if Federal government existed neither in theory nor in practice. We, who believe in its adaptability, make no pretensions to originality; we only say—Apply an existing model of government, which already meets the requirements of vast territories, which are too extensive to have all their affairs, both external and internal, provincial and of general concern, regulated by a simple Executive Government and Parliament. Had Imperial Federalists professed to propose anything original, they would have been guilty of an absurd attempt to pirate a very ancient idea—to establish a claim to have invented a form of government,

which has existed from before the Christian era down to the present time.

Why should this old form of government not be applied on a larger scale than any, upon which it has hitherto been tried? Should it prove a success in our Empire it will amply repay the greatest thought and effort that can be applied to it. If the Imperial idea be so cultivated as to thoroughly possess the people of all portions of the Empire, what obstacles will stand in the way of the establishment of the Federal bond?

Two might deter some people from the attempt to create it—one, the severance by oceans of the different portions of the Empire, and the other, the pride of the old English Parliament, preventing it from giving over Imperial questions to a Parliament of the Empire.

I shall at present say nothing upon the first objection, which every year's improved facilities for communication will tend to eradicate, but merely call attention to one recent instance, showing how easily questions of general interest can be discussed simultaneously at opposite ends of the globe. On April 29, a deputation waited on Lord Carnarvon to advocate the annexation of New Guinea; ten days afterwards a public meeting in favour of the same object was held in Sydney, which was subsequently supported by leading articles in Colonial papers, resolutions of Colonial legislatures, and minutes of Colonial Ministers. Why should not other Imperial questions be in like manner dealt with, had we a Federal union?

Were the present English Parliament to give up to a Federal Parliament the few Imperial questions with which

it now deals, it would really have to sacrifice nothing but a little sentimental pride, for immense substantial advantages, which this country would derive from Federal union with the Colonies. England would be greater and grander by merging herself in a confederation of her Empire, like Prussia since she has merged herself in Germany. Her Parliament would have full control, and be able to devote exclusive attention to all important affairs of these kingdoms, such as Parliamentary reform, Irish church and land questions, education, &c. Full ninety per cent. of the questions which now annually come before the present English Parliament would remain under its jurisdiction, and it would only have to give up such Imperial business, for instance, as the purchase of the shares of the Suez Canal. But if her Parliament lost anything in fame by not having such a question to deal with, England would be a very substantial gainer, for she would not have to provide all the purchase-money, which the Federal Parliament would have to supply from its revenues, drawn from all the dominions of the Empire.

But, considering the immense benefits which Confederation would confer, these two preliminary objections should not be permitted to prevent the attempt being made to frame a Federal constitution. How then would it be necessary to proceed? I should think that the terms of union, when the time arrives for drawing them up—and Mr. Forster has clearly shown that it is not so very remote—should be arranged by delegates representing the Colonies and the mother-country, and ratified by the respective Governments. Objectors will here inter-

pose with a multitude of questions as to details which really suggest only imaginary difficulties. The main point would be the constitution of the Federal Parliament. As to the Lower House, it seems to me that the only question which need be decided would be the proportion of representatives to be allotted to the mother-country and the different Colonies. That having been settled, all the details of the distribution of seats and election of members might be left to the Provincial Parliaments. With Australia, where there is no inter-colonial Confederation, there would be more difficulty than with Canada, for the Imperial Federal Constitution, instead of having only to fix the total number of representatives, leaving their distribution to an inter-colonial Federal Parliament, would have to allot the number separately to each Colony.

As to the creation of the Imperial House of Lords, several plans occur to me, but I can only ask you to allow me to describe one. A certain proportion of its present hereditary peers should represent the United Kingdom in this great Imperial senate, as life members—say half by nomination of the Crown, and half by the House of Lords. For distinguished services, however, the Crown might have power to confer the supreme distinction of a hereditary peerage of the Empire on any of its subjects. The Colonial members of this Senate should be created for life by the Crown on the nomination of the Colonial Executives—by that of the Dominion of Canada, and by those of the separate Colonies of Australia, should they not form a Colonial federation. These Colonial senators,



though only life legislators, should have titles taken from places in their Colonies. It may be objected that the hereditary peers of England, sitting in the Imperial Senate, would ill assort with the life peers; but it must be remembered that only the most intellectually distinguished and large-minded of the English peers would be nominated to the Senate; that they would be gentlemen of the greatest attainments and culture; and we know how harmoniously the highest aristocrats sit as legislators with men of different grade in the House of Commons.

An Imperial Senate, constituted as suggested, would certainly be the most brilliant legislative assembly that could well be formed. It would consist of picked men from the peerage of England and from the aristocracy of intellect and statesmanship of the whole British Empire. The hereditary peerage of the Empire would open up to that of the United Kingdom a still further avenue of distinction; and to be a life peer of this great Senate would be a grand prize open to the statesmen of all our Colonies.

A Parliament with its two houses thus recruited from the wide field of talent, which our Empire would afford, ought to command the largest proportion of legislative and administrative ability which it would be possible to collect. It would be fully equal to the task of conducting Imperial affairs. Mr. Young has mentioned the Ministers, who would require to be transferred from the Cabinet of the United Kingdom to that of the United Empire, and he has thereby indicated the questions which are Imperial.

We should not have in our Confederation the difficulties the Germans and Americans have with theirs—the one with the petty kings and princes who preside over the States in the Union, and the other in having a periodical election for the Chief of the Confederation. It may be said that some Colonies, though wishing to continue in the Empire, would not come into the Union. Very probably all would not consent to come in at once. Neither did all the provinces now in the Dominion of Canada; Newfoundland still stands aloof. Let any one or more of the important sections of the Colonial Empire confederate with England, and the others would soon gravitate to the Union, when they perceived the greatness, importance, and security it would give them.

I would repeat that the time for Federation has not arrived, but in order that the desire for permanent unity should 'realise itself,' we should, as practical men, think well beforehand of the organisation which will be required, so that, when the Empire is ripe for its adoption, it may the more easily be applied.

*December 5.*

---

## LETTER IV.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

IMPORTANCE OF IMPERIAL FEDERATION—VALUE OF MR. FOX'S ADHESION TO THE PRINCIPLE—DEFENCE OF SUGGESTION THAT THE COLONIES SHOULD BE REGARDED AS EXTENSIONS OF THE OLD COUNTRY—PARALLEL DERIVED FROM ENGLISH HISTORY—CENTRAL PARLIAMENT NOT TO ADMINISTER THE LOCAL AFFAIRS OF THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE EMPIRE—DOES THE IDEA PROPOUND AN OLD OR NEW PRINCIPLE?—THERE ARE 'REVOLUTIONS' AND 'REVOLUTIONS'—MISSION OF GREAT BRITAIN TO BE THE GREAT CIVILISER OF MANKIND—IRRESISTIBLE POWER CREATED BY A PERMANENT UNION OF THE EMPIRE.

THE question you have permitted me to discuss in your columns of Imperial Federation, as being the best means of securing the permanent union of the Empire, is so vast, so interesting, and of such vital importance, as affecting the future destinies of Great Britain, that its proper ventilation may well embrace the scope of many letters, not only from myself, but also from your other correspondents, in the reverent treatment of a subject so profound. By your favour I will make a few comments on a letter which appeared in your last number from one whose distinguished career as a Colonial politician entitles his opinion to great weight—Mr. William Fox, the late Premier of New Zealand. With the general tenour of Mr. Fox's remarks, and with his criticisms on my proposals,

I think I have no reason to be dissatisfied. I hail with satisfaction the evident adhesion to the principle I advocate, on the part of one so experienced in the political life of one of the most successful and progressive of our Colonies. Mr. Fox's views on such a subject cannot fail to be most valuable. I am content that he should say, we have set ourselves a 'big task.' I am much more content, he should add, 'I will hope not an insuperable one,' and, 'I should be glad if any humble aid of mine could help you to it.'

Passing by Mr. Fox's thoroughly true and philosophic reflections as to the extent, to which national character is coloured by sentiment; and the noble and patriotic views he expresses, that 'the Colonies should feel themselves to be integral portions of a great nation, entitled to share in the historic greatness of the Empire;' and that 'the parent state should be expanded to the idea, that the Colonies are limbs of her body, and not mere seedling plants, the offspring of casual winds and waves carrying the germs of new nations to distant soils where they have taken accidental root,' I proceed to defend briefly the suggestion I have made, that 'the Colonies should be regarded as merely extensions of the old Country,' and support the parallel I drew from English history to show the practicability of uniting the different portions of the Empire by the constitution of an Imperial and Central Parliament, in one grand scheme of Federation. Mr. Fox demurs to my 'postulate,' that the Colonies should be regarded as extensions of the Empire in the same sense as the States of the Heptarchy were,

and the counties of England are, as 'a dangerous one to rest the case of the Colonies upon.'

But he will forgive me for remarking that my illustration was given merely for the purpose of showing how what had before been scattered portions of the kingdom, under separate and independent jurisdictions, were welded into a union of states, and a subsequent homogeneity of national representation. I pointed out that, if this purpose could be successfully attained in the earlier periods of our history, when the practical difficulties were so enormous of intercommunication between the different parts of England, the discoveries which modern science has placed at the disposal of mankind—and which have practically annihilated distance, as an obstacle to the most ready and constant intercommunication between the various parts of the British Empire—would render a thoroughly Imperial representative Parliament at least as easy now as an English Parliament was then, in the old days to which I alluded.

Mr. Fox appears alarmed lest the admission of my illustration should involve the right of the Central Parliament to tax and administer the local affairs of the subdivisions of the Empire, but this would be quite an unfair assumption as to the result of the admission of the principle of representation I have advocated. I have expressly said that 'such a Parliament as we now have would, like the parliaments of the various Colonies, only deal with local laws and administrations,—including taxation, of course,—English, Irish, and Scotch.' Here I exclude all right of the Parliament of England as at present consti-

tuted, to deal with the local affairs of any subdivision of the Empire excepting its own, which I have expressly particularised. The instance, for example, which Mr. Fox brings forward—a crucial one, no doubt—of the subjects of Church Establishment or Disestablishment, as well as ‘the hundred analogous cases’ which, he says, might be suggested, would not be treated by an ‘Imperial Parliament,’ such as I propose. They would be relegated to the English Parliament, as justly and properly appertaining to the category of questions to be settled—in consequence of their exclusive application to those interests, from which the Colonies claim to be free,—by a representative body chosen to deal with questions ‘English, Irish, and Scotch.’

And this brings me to the consideration of the concluding part of Mr. Fox’s letter, in which he says that, seeing the difficulty of an Imperial Parliament taking up questions of this description, while I only avow that I am proceeding on a mere extension of its principle, I am really proposing a fundamental and entire change in the British Constitution in order to meet it.

I should be sorry that on a question of such grave importance, which deserves to be thought out in a thoroughly reverent spirit by all true patriots and wise and sound-judging men, a point of difference should be raised as to whether the idea proposed is the extension of an old, or the invention of a new, principle. Perfectly satisfied in my own mind of being justified in proclaiming it, as belonging to the former, and therefore no novelty, I have not hesitated to bring forward in its support the

analogy of the origin of the first constitution of the English Parliament, and recommended the parallel being followed by an extension of the principle then adopted, so as to include in one grand Imperial Federal Parliament every portion of the British Home and Colonial Empire. There seemed an especial reason for taking this ground. The words 'revolutionary' and 'revolution' have a perhaps, not unnaturally, ugly ring to English ears. But in listening to the sound of these somewhat alarming words it would be well for reflective minds to recollect that there are such things as 'revolutions' and 'revolutions.' The one may uproot, in violent, lawless, sanguinary overthrow, the most venerable, valuable and time-honoured institutions, and may imperil the existence of civilisation by the mad ferocity of a brutal barbarism. To this the saviours of society are implacably hostile, being reasonably alarmed at its mournful and deplorable results. But the other, instead of overturning and destroying, may regenerate and revivify. It may be the means of forming on a wider basis, and thus adding a new buttress, to the rock on which is built an old and admirable Constitution, requiring to be expanded and developed with the advance of time and the constant progress of the world. If, however, in this latter aspect, my plan for Imperial Federation is, in the language of Mr. Fox, to be called a 'revolution,' I do not shrink from accepting the startling designation without hesitation, and free from the least alarm. I believe it will contribute—if worked out in a thoroughly statesmanlike and unselfish spirit, and without prejudice on the part equally of England and the Colonies

—to their mutual happiness and prosperity, to the grandeur and glory of Great Britain, and to the ultimate realisation of her mission as the great civiliser of mankind, by the irresistible power created by a permanent union of the Empire, enabling her to develop all the noblest objects which seem destined by Providence to be the result of the wonderful expansion of her national life.

*December 23.*

---

## LETTER V.

*From the Hon. WILLIAM FOX.*

PROPOSAL INVOLVES A SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE IN THE CONSTITUTION OF PARLIAMENT—COLONIAL REPRESENTATION NOT FEASIBLE AT PRESENT—MASS OF WORK UNDERTAKEN BY THE ENGLISH PARLIAMENT FOR EVERY LOCAL EMERGENCY—LOCAL MATTERS OUGHT TO BE HANDED OVER TO LOCAL PARLIAMENTS—A GREAT IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT NOT A NEW IDEA—MR. COBDEN—MR. TREVELYAN'S COUNTY HOUSEHOLD SUFFRAGE—PROFESSOR NEWMAN—PRACTICAL IMPEDIMENTS TO THE INTRODUCTION OF COLONIAL REPRESENTATIVES INTO THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT—NEW ZEALAND CONSTITUTION CRITICISED.

**I**N my previous remarks on the subject of Colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament, I expressed my concurrence in Mr. Young's, and your belief,



that such a proposal involves a substantial change in the constitution of Parliament, by the restriction of its functions to purely Federal, or rather Imperial objects. A further reason may be given for the belief that Colonial representation is not feasible at present, when Parliament legislates for every local emergency, however remote in its bearings on the common interests of the nation as a whole. The result is a mass of work, overwhelming in its amount, and inextricable in its confusion. On my return to England last July I was amazed to find the Imperial Parliament engaged, for 'all a summer's day,' in discussing, with the utmost earnestness, the question whether the publicans of Ireland should or should not keep open their shops on Sunday. And I was still more amazed when I saw that this matter, purely local to Ireland, was disposed of by the open action of a Yorkshire representative and the tacit acquiescence of the Imperial Government, against what was understood to be the almost unanimous wish of the Irish people and the probably compact vote of the Irish members. The discussion of this municipal matter created more interest, received more attention, and consumed more of the time of the Imperial Parliament than the annexation of a new Province like Fiji or New Guinea. While such continues to be the order of Parliamentary business, it is evident that the additions of Colonial questions, backed by a Colonial brigade, with all the accompanying party complications, would be an impossibility. The Parliamentary back, already bent double by overwork, would break with the weight of this additional hair.

However, get rid of all this crushing accumulation of work by limiting the Imperial Parliament to matters of a purely Imperial character, and handing over all merely local matters to local Parliaments, as is already done in respect of the Colonies, and you make way for the possibility of Colonial representation in this great Imperial Parliament.

It is not for me to suggest how this great problem is to be worked out. If it is the right thing to be done, there must be some conceivable way of doing it. It is happily not a new idea to either English statesmen or English philosophers. Mr. Cobden, it is well known, had ideas on the subject. Mr. Trevelyan's county household suffrage would be a step in the direction of such a change, and make it possible. And let me refer you to a lecture delivered in the Manchester Athenæum on October 17 last, by Professor Newman,<sup>1</sup> in which he proposes the reorganisation of English institutions on this very basis. You will find the whole question of local Parliaments and Imperial limitation to Imperial interests exhaustively treated by this very able and distinguished lecturer. Curiously enough, the Professor has not adverted to the bearings of the proposed reform on Colonial communities, but they are clearly included in the principles of his suggested system, and would easily fit in with the details, so far as he enters into them.

The conclusion I have arrived at is, that at present there is a practical impediment to the introduction of

<sup>1</sup> Published by J. Heywood, Manchester, and I. Pitman, Paternoster Row, price 1*d.*

Colonial representatives into the British Parliament; and that even if they were there, they could, in the present condition of Parliamentary business, do no good whatever for the Colonies they might represent. To use a common phrase, they would be mere 'chips in porridge,' and their presence unproductive of any good. Some features of Parliamentary party action might suggest that they would be worse than useless, and in many cases I believe they would prove so. Speaking as a Colonist, I would rather not be represented in the British Parliament *as it is*; and I think this is a very general feeling among Colonists, who look at the question, not from a philosophical, but from the 'cui bono' point of view.

I may be asked how far my approval of the constitutional change suggested by Professor Newman is consistent with the action of the New Zealand community at this moment. We in that colony received upwards of twenty years ago a constitution which provided both a general and provincial Parliament, and we are at this moment abolishing the latter, apparently reverting to the position of Great Britain and her single Parliament, on the ground that experience has decided that the provincial Parliaments are a failure. I could give you many reasons to show that the analogy between the two cases is not complete; but there is no necessity for me to argue it now. I may observe, however, that what has led up to the change has been chiefly a fundamental defect in the machinery of our constitution. Special jurisdiction was given to the general Legislature over thirteen subjects of a federal char-

acter, and the provincial Parliaments were debarred from touching these. But the general Legislature was unfortunately not debarred from meddling with provincial interests ; on the contrary, a concurrent and overriding jurisdiction was given to it over all provincial questions. This fatal blot was 'spotted' by Mr. Gladstone in his very able speech on the second reading of our Constitution Act of 1852, and he declared that this feature of it would be productive of 'uncertainty, conflict, and confusion.' It has proved so, and has led to the gradual usurpation of provincial functions by the general Legislature, and finally to the abolition of the former on the ground that there was nothing left for them to do. At present I think that, under the circumstances, the course pursued is the right one ; though I do not feel at all sure that the day may not come when, if our Parliament is as over-burdened with local work as that of Great Britain is, we may not find it necessary to decentralise again. In the meantime it must be borne in mind that a very large amount of local machinery is being substituted for the provincial Parliaments in the shape of local Road Boards, Education Boards, and other bodies of a municipal character.

*December 26.*

---

## LETTER VI.

*From the DUKE OF MANCHESTER.*

COLONIES ENTITLED TO A SHARE IN DIRECTING THE POLICY OF THE EMPIRE WHEN THEIR INTERESTS ARE AFFECTED ; TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY INAUGURATING A NEW CHAMBER IN WHICH THE UNITED KINGDOM AND COLONIES SHOULD BE REPRESENTED IN DUE PROPORTIONS—PRIVY COUNCIL SCHEME—COLONIAL REPRESENTATIVES IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—BOTH EQUALLY OBJECTIONABLE—POWER TO TAX FOR IMPERIAL, NOT LOCAL PURPOSES.

ALLOW me to make some remarks on Mr. Fox's letter in your issue of the 24th. It seems to me that he misunderstands Mr. Young. I have no further right to speak on Mr. Young's behalf than from my belief that his opinion and mine on the subject of Imperial Federation are, if not identical, pretty nearly so. But I will not take the liberty of speaking for him. I prefer to state my own views. Before I joined the Royal Colonial Institute I had long held the opinion that the Colonies were entitled to a share in directing the policy of the Empire in any questions which affected their interests. I think all the members of the Institute admitted the right. But there was great diversity of opinion as to how the right was to be exercised. Our late most respected Secretary advocated the appointment of representatives of the Colonies to the Privy Council. My objection to that was, that it was

perfectly optional to the Minister of the day whether he should or should not ask the advice of members of the Privy Council. Others advocated that which Mr. Fox deprecates—namely, representatives of the Colonies in the Commons House of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. But I think Mr. Fox is in error in supposing that Mr. Young is in favour of such an arrangement. For my part, I have for years thought it as objectionable as the Privy Council scheme. It is not likely that the United Kingdom would sacrifice constituencies in its own area to admit representatives from beyond the seas. Its assembly is already too large for the chamber in which it sits. And if representatives of the Colonies were admitted, it could be only in such small numbers that their influence would be absolutely a negative quantity unless they organised themselves into a band of obstructives. We may easily imagine what sympathy there would be for the Colonies if their representatives adopted that course.

I hold that the only practicable scheme is to inaugurate a new Chamber in which the United Kingdom and the Colonies should be represented in due proportions. It is not at present necessary to decide how those proportions are to be calculated. I also think it unnecessary to go to the Parliament of the United Kingdom asking them to sanction a scheme for a Legislature superseding it. I should say that the best policy would be to suggest a body of representatives from the Colonies to advise the Secretary for the Colonies. You will ask, 'What security is there that the Colonial Secretary would ever consult such

a council? or that, if he did consult it, he would act on their advice?' I ask, in return, how the House of Commons obtained its power. It was at first summoned to advise. It acquired its supremacy by voting money. I say, therefore, let us first get a Council to advise the Colonial Secretary. There is such a Council in the India Office, but it is not representative, and cannot vote money, therefore it has no power. Then let the Colonies vote subsidies for naval and military purposes, and their voice in the government of the Empire would be in proportion to the subsidies they vote. The number of their representatives might be in proportion to the amount of their subsidies, but that would be of little importance; for I think you will admit that £ *s.d.* would carry the day. Perhaps the Colonies are not at present prepared to vote money. But the day may arrive when they will be willing to do so. In the meantime, if we have organised a Council such as I describe, the Colonies would have the means of regulating the expenditure of any supplies they might vote.

*December 27.*

---

## LETTER VII.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

DUKE OF MANCHESTER — COLONIAL REPRESENTATIVES IN ENGLISH PARLIAMENT — NEW IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT — COMPREHENSIVE SCHEME OF FEDERATION—LORD DERBY AT EDINBURGH—CHANGE OF COLONIAL POLICY EXTRAORDINARY—DREAMERS AND DOCTRINAIRES —INEXPEDIENCY OF GIVING DETAILS OF ANY PLAN OF IMPERIAL FEDERATION—NECESSARY TO LOOK FORWARD—FEDERATION ALREADY THOUGHT OF IN THE COLONIES—ULTIMATE GRAND IDEAL SUGGESTED.

IN his letter of the 27th ult., the Duke of Manchester has added an interesting and valuable contribution to the discussion of the question of Imperial Federation. I am glad to be able to confirm his Grace's belief that his opinion and my own on this subject are 'pretty nearly identical.' I certainly do not think that any arrangement for the introduction of representatives from the Colonies into our Parliament, as at present constituted, would answer at all. The Duke himself supplies the best possible reasons, to my mind, why such a plan would never be likely to succeed. Colonial representatives could only be admitted into the existing English Parliament in proportions so limited that they would never have the influence in it, to which they would expect to be entitled; and besides, they would have to deal with a multitude of subjects, with which they would have no direct concern, and



in which they would feel no interest. Colonial representation can never, I am satisfied, be successful in this direction. Federation, on the thoroughly broad basis of the construction of a new Imperial Parliament, containing representatives in equitable proportion from every part of our Home and Colonial Empire to manage and settle Imperial questions, is the only one which would satisfy the just requirements of the Colonies, and meet the expectations of the English people, scattered over the wide expanse of so many regions of the globe. This would be a representative system in which they all fairly participated. Such a Federation would bind the British Empire into a union which might be indissoluble. That such a Federation is not at all impracticable, I and others have already endeavoured to show.

The conception of a scheme so comprehensive and so grand, is one which, to shallow and timid thinkers, appears chimerical; while to those who, in watching the progress of mundane affairs, are content to accept the dogma of the development of 'drift,' it seems Utopian to endeavour to anticipate and to suggest plans of far-reaching policy. They prefer the narrower line of living from 'hand to mouth,' and trusting to events, into the causes of which they have not troubled themselves to enquire, to bring about what results they may. But if they took the pains to look deeper, and examine more closely, they would find that many of the greatest successes which have been brought about in our own political history have been the result of the lucubrations of those whom practical men afterwards, doing only what was before them to do, with-

out perceiving the results they themselves were helping to bring about, would call *visionaries* and *dreamers*.

Lord Derby, in a recent speech at Edinburgh, made some remarks in reference to the relations of England and her Colonies. In them we have the characteristic utterances of our present frigid, philosophic Foreign Secretary. His Lordship evidently is one of those who think there is no practical use in trying to look far into futurity, when we are dealing with the relations which ought to subsist between this country and such communities as Australia and Canada. He has no faith in any political machinery, however ingenious, for the maintenance of the cordial relations which we wish to preserve. But he does not appear to consider, that confidence in the practical attainment of all those things, which in his estimation—as in ours—would go far to prevent a wish for separation growing up in any of our Colonies, is only likely to be found in their sentiments, wishes, and interests being thoroughly known—and above all, their reciprocal power with the mother-country recognised—by means of direct participation in Imperial representation.

One of the most curious remarks in Lord Derby's address in connection with this subject, is his allusion to the change in regard to Colonial policy, which, within the last twenty-five years has been, as he says, 'extraordinary.' For years after he entered Parliament in 1849, he admits, that the doctrine which found most favour was, 'that a Colonial Empire added nothing to real strength, involved needless expense, and increased liability to war.' But, continues his lordship, 'now everybody is for holding the

Colonies we have got, and “many people are in favour of finding new ones.”

Is it possible he has failed to recognise the cause which has produced this change of public opinion? There can be no doubt that it is the result of the earnest and persistent dissemination of the views of those ‘dreamers,’ who, in direct antagonism to the doctrinaires of a quasi-economic school—previously spreading the ideas of a plausible but false philosophy among the leaders of public opinion in this country—combated their unsound theories, and effectually turned the current of national sentiment into the more true and patriotic channel in which it now happily flows. If they had neglected to look forward, and had been content to let things slide, the pernicious doctrines previously promulgated would perhaps have taken deep and abiding root; and instead of the loyal love we all, in the mother-country and Colonies, feel for one another, the detestable doctrine of disintegration would have grown and flourished, till at last it might have ended in producing the separation, we will now hope, may perhaps for ever be averted.

Let me add a few words as to the inexpediency of at present propounding many details of any plan of Imperial Federation. It seems to me to be unwise to do so. In bringing before the public any scheme so vast, it is necessary to give some outline of what is sought to be accomplished; but the great thing, after all, is to familiarise the public mind with the idea, and to induce its being thoroughly thought out, so as to obtain the conviction of the desirability of its being effected. When once the

correctness of the principle is admitted, the means of carrying it out will be sure to follow.

Unlike Lord Derby, who is content passively to watch and wait whatever development time may bring, I do think it necessary to look forward, so that progress may be made in the direction, and on the lines, which many of us think are necessary, in order that the greatness of our common country may continue to increase, and be preserved. I appeal, therefore, to my fellow-countrymen, —equally to those at home, as in the Colonies,—calmly, and fairly, and especially without jealousy or prejudice, to aid in the solution of one of the grandest problems which can be submitted to them, by earnestly and temperately directing their attention to the attainment of an object which must conduce to their own security and prosperity, by strengthening the power of the great Empire to which they have the honour to belong.

Federation is a thought which has already taken possession of men's minds, and is moulding itself into practical shape. It is being adopted by other nations. In our own dominions Canada has already federated. South Africa is actually engaged in seriously contemplating it, with every prospect of ultimate success. The same question is also becoming one of current politics, ripening for solution, in our Australian Colonies.

We would, however, remind our Transatlantic and Antipodean fellow-countrymen that, advantageous, as we admit, is the idea of their grouping themselves together in the bonds of these various Federations, there is, among some of us, a yet far more advantageous and a better and

nobler conception still. It is this—that the Federal Unions which are being gradually founded may culminate in the grand ideal of a national political column being raised, the crowning of whose ‘capital,’ in the fulness of time may be the establishment of Imperial Federation.

*January 20, 1876.*

---

## LETTER VIII.

*From the Hon. WILLIAM FOX.*

AGREEMENT WITH MR. YOUNG—VIEWS IDENTICAL—BOTH BELIEVE THAT FEDERATION WOULD BE A GOOD THING—DUKE OF MANCHESTER’S COUNCIL OF ADVICE—COLONISTS WOULD NOT AGREE TO IT—FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE IN THE CHARACTER OF PARLIAMENT NECESSARY TO PREPARE THE WAY FOR FEDERATION.

**A**BSENCE from my temporary home prevented my seeing the letter of his Grace the Duke of Manchester in your paper of the 8th ult. His Grace thinks that I have misunderstood Mr. Young. In this I think he is in error. Mr. Young and myself are quite agreed. We both believe that Federation would be a good thing, but not in the form of representation in the British Parliament, *constituted as it now is*. We both consider Federation as only possible when the Parliament shall have been

relieved of much of its purely local work, and acquired a strictly Federal and Imperial character. My criticism of Mr. Young's views was directed towards the position taken by him that the Colonies were entitled to representation on the ground that they were extensions of the empire, as Yorkshire or Cumberland are. I pointed out that this involved consequences to which the Colonies could not agree, but while differing from the ground on which Mr. Young placed his case, I concurred in his conclusion. Our views are, I believe, identical.

I am sorry that I cannot agree in his Grace's suggestion, that we might best attain our end by passing through the chrysalis state of a Council of Advice. Such a Council would have no real power. The Secretary for the Colonies could accept or reject its advice as he thought proper. The Colonists would not attach the smallest value to it, nor would they, I think, consent to send representatives to such a body. Till they could exercise actual power by a controlling majority over a responsible Minister, as majorities in Parliament do now, I do not think they would care for the privilege of tendering advice. Nor do I see how the experience of such a consulting body would prepare the way for actual representative federation. According to Mr. Young's view and my own, the way can only be prepared by a fundamental change in the character of Parliament. The Council suggested would have no tendency to effect that change.

*February 1.*

## LETTER IX.

*From 'COLONUS.'*

IDEA OF FEDERATION ADMIRABLE, BUT NOT PRACTICABLE—NO COLONY HAS ASKED FOR IT—IMPERIAL SUBJECTS LIMITED—CUI BONO—'TWICE IN A CENTURY'—MERITS OF A COUNCIL OF ADVICE—AIDS AND CHECKS TO COLONIAL OFFICE—'SOMETHING MIGHT GROW OUT OF THIS'—ELECTIVE ELEMENT DESIRABLE—DANGER OF LOCAL JEALOUSIES.

HAVING passed the best part of my life in Australia, I have read various letters on Imperial Confederation in your paper with deep interest. No doubt the idea is admirable, but is it practicable? I fear not.

No Colony has asked for it. If offered I believe none would accept it. What could be offered to them? A representation in the British Parliament is recommended by none of your correspondents, and would certainly be declined by the Colonies. It is open to so many objections that it need not be discussed.

Some propose a share of the representation in an Imperial body to legislate on Imperial subjects. I should like to ask what matters of Imperial legislation exist, except those of peace and war, and postal communication. Would England endure that Colonial votes should drag her into a war, or would she allow her hands to be tied if her honour were outraged? As to postal arrangements,

no serious complaint has ever been made, unless when the interests of rival Colonies conflict, in which case the Postmaster-General has proved a most useful umpire. A measure establishing Free-Trade, so much to be desired, which in all common sense ought to be an Imperial measure, would be an encroachment on the rights of the local legislatures, so would any affecting religion, education, marriage, &c. Either the functions of this body must be very limited, or they must encroach on the existing powers of self-government ; in the first case, *cui bono* ; in the second the offer would be declined.

If this new Imperial body were established are we to have two Houses of Parliament? Are the Ministers of the day to be responsible to the Parliament of England or to that of the Empire, or to both? In case of a conflict what is to be done? In which House should the Ministers hold seats? Is this body to have taxing power? If so it would be at once repudiated by the Colonies. Is such a cumbrous machine wanted to legislate on one or two questions which may not arise twice in a century?

The question of a Council of Advice is a very different one, and merits consideration. I am far from thinking that more direct local information would not be of use in Downing Street. Of late years we have not seen instances of the gross ignorance of local wants and wishes which characterised former administrations. This has possibly been caused by improved means of communication, the appointment of Agents for several Colonies, and also by the presence of Mr. Herbert, a distinguished Colonist, in the Colonial Office.



Ample materials exist for such a Council. There are many retired governors who are unwedded to local interests and prejudices, but fully alive to facts. Men like Lord Lisgar, who distinguished himself in New South Wales and Canada; Sir Henry Barkly, who served with credit in Guiana, Jamaica, Victoria, Mauritius, and the Cape of Good Hope; Sir Richard Macdonnell, who could contribute his aid in affairs affecting the Gambia, South Australia, and Hong Kong; Sir Rawson Rawson, who has seen service in Canada, Cape of Good Hope, Mauritius, and Barbadoes, and many other equally celebrated persons. All these have pensions, and as they would have little to do they need not be paid.

To this body I would give no power whatever but that of advice, which would materially aid the Colonial Office, and would save it from any serious blunder. The moral effect of any recommendation emanating from such a body would be quite sufficient to ensure its adoption. In time, possibly, something might grow out of this.

I do not myself see why the elective element might not be introduced, by allowing the chief Colonies to select as their representative anyone who had held a commission as governor. A power might be used, if desirable, to select some very leading Colonist, but unworthy local jealousies are so strong that this should be used very seldom, if at all.

*February 1.*

---

## LETTER X.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

COLONIES AS COUNTIES AGAIN DEFENDED—EQUALITY OF IMPERIAL PARTNERSHIP—ANONYMOUS CORRESPONDENT—PEACE AND WAR AND POSTAL COMMUNICATION—CONTRACTED VIEWS OF 'COLONUS'—INTERESTS OF ENGLAND AND HER COLONIES IDENTICAL—COUNCIL OF ADVICE A COMPLETE FAILURE—DETAILS OF ANY PLAN OF IMPERIAL FEDERATION DECLINED—STATESMANSHIP AND PATRIOTISM—THE FRAMING OF CONSTITUTIONS FITTED TO ENDURE, A QUESTION OF THE FUTURE.

I HAVE already so fully given my reasons for suggesting the idea that in any scheme for Imperial Federation the Colonies might be regarded as expansions of the counties of England, that it would seem almost unnecessary for me to refer to this point again for the purpose of defending it. The remarks, however, in Mr. Fox's letter of the 1st inst., that his criticism was directed towards the position I had taken up, 'that the Colonies were entitled to representation on the ground that they were extensions of the Empire, as Yorkshire and Cumberland are,' seem to demand from me a further brief word of explanation. I will merely reply to this erroneous construction of the position actually advanced by me by referring him to my letter of the 23rd of December last, which I think must fully satisfy him that my illustration

was simply intended to show 'how what had before been scattered portions of the Kingdom under separate and independent jurisdictions were welded into a Union of States, and a subsequent homogeneity of national representation.' Because I happen to have been born in Middlesex, I am not necessarily proud of my *county*, but I am proud of my *country*, and I glory in the thought of being able to call myself a Briton. This is the sentiment I desire all my countrymen to feel, whether they are Transatlantic, or Antipodean born, equally with myself, and this alone was the idea which prompted the suggestion I made. I have from the first endeavoured to proclaim most emphatically to my countrymen in the Colonies that my views induce me to recognise in the widest sense their perfect independence and freedom from tutelage to the mother-country. The Imperial partnership I so ardently desire to see effected, must, in my opinion, be promoted on terms of perfect equality. This is the only ground on which I base my case. That so distinguished an authority as Mr. Fox should admit that he concurs in my conclusion, although he demurs to what he considers—erroneously as I have shown—my premise, is as important in the discussion of this great question, as it is satisfactory to me that he should say, with the Duke of Manchester, 'Our views, I believe, are identical.'

I now proceed to notice the letter of the 'anonymous' correspondent who appears in your columns under the weighty and authoritative signature of 'Colonus.' I could certainly have wished he had added to the confi-

dence he claims to be given to his opinions, from the announcement of the fact of his 'having passed the best part of his life in Australia,' by lifting the veil of his anonyne, and allowing us to know his real name. We should be better able to judge the worth of his views and of his colonial experience, more especially when they are opposed to those of an eminent representative colonist like Mr. Fox. However, taking him as he is, albeit with his vizor down, I am not afraid to enter into the lists, and endeavour to break a friendly lance with him.

Your correspondent, I am glad to see, commences his letter by saying 'No doubt the idea is admirable.' This I consider to be a most satisfactory admission. If we can only get the British people, at home and in the Colonies, to admit this much, a really important step will be gained in the solution of the question of Imperial Federation. But I am soon at issue with my opponent. He asks if the 'admirable idea' is practicable, and then curtly answers his own question by the short and dogmatic answer, 'I fear not.' To this, on the contrary, backed in my opinion by Mr. Fox, I reply, if the problem is so 'admirable'—if it is, in fact, the right thing to be done—there must be some conceivable way of doing it.

'Colonus' considers he has put forward an unanswerable challenge when he goes on to say, 'No Colony has asked for it'; and then in his favourite style of answering his own question, before others have had an opportunity of replying to him, he at once adds, 'if offered, I believe none would accept it.' Here I would remark that it would be perfectly preposterous to expect, that such a

proposal as Imperial Federation should emanate from the Colonies. The conception of such a bold enlargement and complete change in the British Constitution must originate with the mother-country, and be laid before the Colonies as a plan of inestimable benefit and blessing to the outlying portions of the Empire. It could never be expected, in the nature of things, to be started by the Colonies themselves. The opinion of 'Colonus' is merely an individual one, as to whether, or not, if offered, they would accept it, which he gives no evidence whatever to justify.

Again, we are tersely asked to affirm, that only *two* matters of Imperial legislation exist—namely 'peace and war,' and 'postal communication.' I am surprised that the fertile brain of 'Colonus,' who appears to be very fond of the use of the favourite question 'Cui bono,' by which the cynic and the supine endeavour to extinguish the consideration of every plan of human progress and improvement, should fancy that those who differ from him are likely to limit the functions of Imperial legislation only to those two matters, vitally important as they are—and most especially the *former*—to the destinies of every civilised nation. However, let me remind him seriously that he is utterly and inconceivably in error in suggesting, as he does, that such a question as that of peace or war 'may not arise twice in a century.' Why, have we not proofs out of number, even without being able to penetrate into the archives, or to be cognisant of the State secrets of our Ministry for Foreign Affairs, that such questions, far from being those which might only arise 'twice in a

century,' more probably are in perilous proximity to the nation at least '*twice* in a year'?

Moreover, I assert, in entire opposition to the contracted, insular, and provincial views of 'Colonus,' who asks, with apparently triumphant cynicism, 'Would England endure that Colonial votes should drag her into a war, or would she allow her hands to be tied, if her honour were outraged?' that under the new Imperial Constitution I desire to see established for the whole British Empire, no such distinction could possibly arise between England and her Colonies. Their interests would be identically the same. What touched the honour of one would equally affect the honour of the other. The sympathies, the interests, the feelings of all would be bound up together. Their sentiments would be clearly expressed by a system of direct and just Parliamentary representation. The Empire would be, in fact, one, equal, and indivisible. The same argument would apply therefore to the question of postal communication. It would be the same also with other Imperial questions, although all others are eliminated from the category, which 'Colonus' has laid down, but which might probably find a place in my own programme, as properly and legitimately belonging to them. With regard to the proposition of a Council of Advice, which appears to find such favour with 'Colonus,' and with which he seems to be so much fascinated as to devote to it no inconsiderable portion of his letter, I am fortunately spared the necessity of replying to him, as Mr. Fox has already by anticipation, so fully and admirably shown that such a plan would completely fail,

as it would never be accepted by Colonists, who would not attach the slightest value to it. Having already expressed my views as to the inexpediency of discussing the details of any plan of Imperial Federation, until the principle of so vast a scheme has been mastered and thoroughly recognised by the British people, I decline to be drawn into answering the questions put forward by 'Colonus,'—shrouded, as he is, in the security of his anonymous irresponsibility,—on the subject of the Constitution, of the proposed Imperial Parliament. When the proper time arrives, plans of detail, more or less worthy of merit, and likely to prove acceptable, will be put forward, for the purpose of making a Constitution of such grandeur and importance to the whole Empire fitly workable. But these are matters requiring the highest exercise of statesmanship, as well as the most devoted patriotism. Some of us may already have formed the outline of embryo plans, and have some crude ideas on this noble and lofty subject ; but in my judgment such things should be relegated to the future, until they have found a favourable place in the brains of other men, more apt at framing Constitutions, fitted to endure, than either 'Colonus' or myself.

*February 16.*

---

## LETTER XI

*From 'COLONUS.'*

FEDERATION OF ADJACENT COLONIES—COMPETITION—RIVAL SCHEMES—  
RAILWAYS AND TELEGRAPHIC LINES—IMMIGRATION—PROTECTION,  
AND FREE TRADE—DIFFICULTIES OF COLONIAL LEGISLATION—SIR  
W. F. STAWELL ON FEDERATION.

**I**N a recent letter I pointed out some of the practical difficulties attending an Imperial Federation, embracing the United Kingdom and the several British Colonies.

The question of the Federation of a group of adjacent Colonies is not open to the same objections. In North America the urgency for such an arrangement was greater than elsewhere. In South Africa such a step seems to be most desirable, and no one can be acquainted with the legislation of the Australian group without seeing the advantage of following so good an example.

Local jealousies are bad enough, and may excite the mirth of travellers like Mr. Anthony Trollope, but a systematic rivalry in legislation is of serious and lasting injury.

We have seen a competition between New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia, each trying to frame a land system to attract population from its neighbours. The result, so far, has been a triumph to New South



Wales, who with her free selection has outbid her sisters, and tempted considerable numbers to leave Victoria and transfer themselves and their property to the former. Victoria had tried a similar game with much success in attracting settlers from South Australia.

These rival schemes, which involve the squandering of the National Domains, the Crown Lands, alienated at half their saleable value, on vicious principles, have all proved failures. A Federation would at least have secured an uniform system, and prevented this species of Dutch auction between competing rivals.

When railways were laid out by each separate Colony no regard was paid to any system, or to general utility. Each seaport looked to its own immediate trade. Even then, lines were too often laid out to promote local political interests, and otherwise were jobbed.

A similar want of system has been displayed in the plans for telegraphic lines.

Most people are agreed that a healthy stream of immigration is essential to the rapid development of a new country. The cheap and constant communication by sea and land renders it difficult, if not impossible, for any one Colony to take action to relieve its own need, however pressing it may be. If Victoria imported labour, the greater part of it would find its way to Riverina, where it is in greater demand. South Australia and New Zealand are now trying the experiment, and will spend their money for the benefit of the other Colonies. As soon as the rate of wages is affected in any one Colony, that moment these unsettled immigrants wander elsewhere.

This objection to the Wakefield system was owned by the late Mr. E. Gibbon Wakefield, to the writer of this letter, but was never answered. Experience has proved what Mr. Wakefield acknowledged, that there must be simultaneous action on the part of all the group.

Can anything be more suicidal than that a system of protection should prevail at Melbourne, whilst Sydney, by establishing free-trade, diverts commerce to her own wharves? Whichever system is right, clearly it ought to be uniform throughout Australia.

The questions of border customs duties, and of an organised and co-operative defence against foreign aggression, and co-operation between the police of the various districts, are at present neglected, but could easily be dealt with by a central Federal Council.

Much of the difficulty in conducting Colonial legislation arises from the reluctance of the best men to mix in politics. It may fairly be hoped that, by affording a wider sphere for talent and for fame, some might be induced to enter into the arena, and to act on the stirring advice of Sir William Foster Stawell, Chief-Justice of Victoria, who, on a recent occasion, in urging the necessity of Federation, entreated his hearers to drop their local municipal instincts, and 'to become citizens of the world, their own world, at all events.'

*February 11.*

---

## LETTER XII.

*From 'COLONUS.'*

VOLTAIRE—NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MR. FOX AND 'COLONUS'—IMPERIAL FEDERATION ADMIRABLE, IF PRACTICABLE—SIR THOMAS MORE'S UTOPIA—BRITISH PARLIAMENT AND FEDERAL 'COUNCIL'—FOREIGN WAR AND POSTAL COMMUNICATION—TWO MINISTRIES—HOME RULE—IS INDIA TO BE REPRESENTED?

VOLTAIRE considered a sneer to be the best argument. Mr. Young appears to agree with him; I do not.

Being a modest man, and not ambitious of notoriety either by writing in your columns or by speaking at the Royal Colonial Institute, I choose to write under my *nom de plume* 'Colonus,' with which I am taunted by Mr. Young. I will only reply that I have been an Australian colonist of considerable experience, and am not afraid of the friendly joust with him, which he proffers, or even with Mr. Fox, with whose opinion he thinks that he can crush me, but between whom and me I suspect that there will be little real difference. I prefer to maintain my position, by reasoning on the merits of the case, and not by the use or the abuse of names, however influential.

I freely repeat the admission that the idea of Imperial Federation is admirable if practicable, and that its

discussion at the present time may be useful, even if for no other reason than that it affords a proof to our fellow-countrymen in the Colonies of the sympathy and interest which is felt for them in England. I demur to Mr. Young's conclusion that, 'if an idea is good, there must be some conceivable way of carrying it out;' there were many admirable ideas in Sir Thomas More's Utopia which have not been acted on since. I also differ from him in thinking it premature to discuss practical difficulties—*i.e.* if the wish is to arrive at a practical result. If the object is merely to write and talk, I quite agree with him: on the contrary, I believe that the real way is to court and to discuss objections in order that, if possible, they may be met. I much fear that Mr. Young has not thought out his subject. He admits that he deals in general principles in the hope that the 'fertile brains' of others may give shape to his suggestions. He avoids answering my first question—namely, 'What are the Imperial questions with which a Federal Council could deal?' I shall throughout these letters, for greater clearness, use that term in contradistinction to the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Before Constitutions were granted to the various Colonies it might have been possible and desirable to have reserved powers of legislation to an Imperial Government, either the British Parliament or a Federal Council; but, since none such have been reserved, and plenary powers of legislation have been given to, and enjoyed by our Colonial Legislatures, is anyone sanguine enough to believe that any one of them will abdicate

their powers and delegate them to an assembly sitting in London? I for one have no such expectation. Much more probably the proposal would be resented as an indirect attempt to recall some of their much valued liberties. Any such renunciation of authority would have to be unanimously assented to by all the Colonies, or the Federal Council could not act at all.

In a former letter I admitted that there were two questions which might be discussed by it—those of foreign war, including of course the maintenance of the defence of the Empire in time of peace, and of postal communication. As the latter merely consists in making contracts once in twelve years with the Peninsular and Oriental and Royal Mail Companies, it is scarcely worth while to create such a cumbrous machinery for what is already done to mutual satisfaction by the Postmaster-General and each Colonial Government. Lord Palmerston used to deprecate ‘the use of a steam-engine to cut cucumbers.’

The question of Imperial defence would, I admit, be an important matter (I believe the only one) for the consideration of the Federal Council, but this involves an enormous power of taxation. Even during peace nearly one-third of the revenue is expended on these services, whilst in time of war the cost would be unlimited. Is it likely that communities with full legislative powers already, and which are imbued with a proverbial power of taxation, will agree to share in an expenditure from which they are now exempt?

But suppose, for the sake of argument, that the

Federal Council were formed, that the two Houses were established, that the Peerage and Commons of the United Kingdom had abdicated their functions, and that all the Colonial Legislatures had done the same. Let me ask, are we to have two Ministries—one responsible to the Federal Council for Imperial measures, and another responsible to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, or rather, I should say, to the three Parliaments of England, Ireland, and Scotland? For on what possible ground could 'Home Rule' be then refused? The proposal for a Ministry responsible to the Federal Council can scarcely be seriously pressed; but, on the other hand, how could an English Ministry serve two masters—be responsible to the Federal Council and to the English Parliament? Has such an *Imperium in imperio* ever been read of in history?

I do trust that Mr. Young will abandon his intention of not answering, as to what Imperial questions can be dealt with by the Federal Council, until his or 'some other fertile brains' have solved these difficulties and framed a workable plan for revolutionising the world.

P.S.—I would ask, is India to be represented in the Federal Council? If so, the representation of each Colony would be infinitesimally small.

*March 1.*

---

## LETTER XIII.

*From 'AN IMPERIALIST.'*

NATIONAL FEELING AROUSED—A GREAT EMPIRE—SUEZ CANAL—THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND A NOBLE ONE—REAL RELATION OF THE COLONIES AND THE MOTHER-COUNTRY—REVOLUTION OF FEELING—MORAL FORCE—FEDERATION MOVEMENT ADVANCING IN THE COLONIES—A GRANDER FEDERATION STILL—TIME NOT COME FOR DEVISING EXACT PLAN—INFLUENCE OF A GREAT WAR—SIZE A PROMOTER OF UNITY—HOW THE SUPREME PROBLEM IS TO BE SOLVED.

WE are living in the midst of a noble arousing of national feeling. The people of England have wakened up to a vivid consciousness that they possess or rather that they constitute a great Empire. The response made to the act of the Government in purchasing the shares in the Suez Canal has been an almost unanimous response of delighted enthusiasm. For many a long year the high spirit of the English people has been persistently dulled down by its Government into forgetting that it had any interest, beyond those of commerce and making profits beyond the coasts of the United Kingdom. The sentiment that we were a great people, bound by duty, qualified by strength, and impelled by the sense that Providence had given us a field of action which it concerned our self-respect and our happiness to play a great part in, lay dormant in the breasts of most Englishmen. Almost,

we had reached the depth of supposing that after all we were only, as the first Napoleon called us, a nation of shopkeepers. The boldness and decision of the Government in purchasing an interest in the Suez Canal, in the face of all Europe, without asking anyone's leave, or enquiring what he might think of it, has spread the universal feeling that we are awaking out of a bad dream. The delighted people have seen the glorious truth shining in the blaze of the recognition by the whole world that England after all is as strong, and above all, as high-spirited as ever, and their hearts have been stirred within them that they are, what the noble history of their fathers revealed at every time, Englishmen.

But though great was the merit of the Government, and wonderful its effects, we must not leave the public feeling wholly out of account, or deprive it of its due of the general praise. It would be a mistake to suppose that the thought of India alone was present to the public mind when it heard that the great highway had been secured for perpetual intercommunication. The process of shaking off the general drowsiness had already commenced for some time previously, and had made the most marked advance. The revolution of feeling as to the real relation which the Colonies bore to the mother-country was something yet stronger and more memorable than the decisive act of the foreign policy of the Government. The transition, from the artificial and conceited notion that the Colonies were children who had obtained their majority, and being good only for trade, had better relieve the old mother's household of



the expense of their keep, to the natural and real conviction that they were members of the same family, limbs of the same country, had established itself in public opinion before the conspicuous action of Mr. Disraeli. That act, I am firmly persuaded, was itself in a degree an emanation from the movements which were surging in the national feeling of Englishmen. The moral force which had scattered to the winds the lazy and low-toned ideas which presented colonists as buyers and sellers of goods only, made the thoughts of the country look abroad, and from that moment the perception of the Empire steadily advanced in the public mind. And as the speeches in the House of Commons have shown, the country forced into the discussion of the Canal, associations other than purely Indian, and which were entitled to equal weight.

The same wave of feeling passed over the Colonies ; all the members of the one body politic sympathised with each other ; what surer sign could there be that they are one and the same people ? This movement of soul finds its expression at this hour in the idea of Federation. The actual unity of fact does not satisfy the sentiment of brotherhood, so vividly acting in the mind. The connecting links of the several parts are seen to be too weak, too inadequately constructed, and the unity of the whole State is not realised in sufficiently visible form. Stronger and better devised organisms are now known to be needed, and the thoughts of many able and statesmanlike men are directed to the developing of political machinery capable of performing the work which the soul-stirring

conception of a British Empire summons them to execute.

Federation divides itself into two distinct parts—firstly, organic connection of the several colonial communities into large provinces or dominions, and secondly, a closer cohesion and unification of the provinces with the centre. I cannot doubt that the first class of Federation must have a general precedence in time—and for this decisive reason. The several branches or limbs of the colonial group, in size and developed importance, are on a level more or less with each other ; they thus have acquired a very natural tendency, arising, not out of sentiment only, but also out of the realities of their position, to run into fusion. Still more—and this is a force of great power and importance—they have generated common wants which union with their immediate neighbours is best adapted to satisfy. Their general condition is more uniform than that of England with respect to the Colonies. Their Legislatures are occupied with the same general character of business ; they are not encumbered with those endless questions and difficulties which an old country, resting so strongly on habit and tradition as England does, perpetuates in ancient institutions. So the Federation movement is advancing in the Colonies. Canada achieved a great Dominion not long since, whilst the conflicts of interest and feeling which the solution of the arduous problem created, furnished a grand political education to all its members. They learned the necessity and excellence of the most characteristic of English virtues—compromise. South Africa is engaged in the same healthful and

beneficial struggle. The foreign element renders the complications more embarrassing; yet it cannot be doubted, if the position of the Dutch Republics is studied, that their fusion with their English neighbours is a work of time only.

We are thus led up to the grander Federation—that with the mother-country—a theme opened as far back as November the 24th, and handled with great ability and earnestness by Mr. Young, the energetic Honorary Secretary of the Royal Colonial Institute. I own to a feeling that the accomplishment, or even the taking up of this problem as a matter of business is still premature. To keep it before the mind always—to cherish a passionate desire for its achievement; to watch every opportunity of moving it a step forward; to look about for every link which may be worked into the final chain; to study it with especial reference to historical teaching and the peculiarities of the respective positions on both sides—are duties as full of pleasure as they are of importance. But I cannot get rid of the conviction that to devise beforehand, by the help of theory and general ideas, the exact organisation which will serve the great purpose, is a course which will not bring success. Connections and cohesions which grow out of real and specific wants are the true stones wherewith to construct the building. As the Duke of Manchester has so admirably pointed out, the power of the mightiest element in the British Constitution, the House of Commons, had its origin in the want of money felt by the Crown. This was a practical fact; and nothing, all the world over, is more practical and

more real than the House of Commons. As the dominions multiply and wax stronger, they will have questions to debate with England, which will call for great skill to overcome difficulties. Each victory won, paves the way for greater triumphs. I entertain no doubt that the struggle which we have lately witnessed in South Africa will ultimately end in drawing that great Colony much more closely to the mother-country. So it has been with such fights in England; so it will be in the broad acres of the whole Empire. No plan, as it seems to me, has yet been shaped which it is advisable to put forward at once, as sure to bring us to the desired goal. A great war would advance the cause mightily; for then common wants would instantly arise, to be met only by joint organisation. The Mutiny—deplorable as it was—greatly consolidated the British Empire in India. Size is obviously a most efficient promoter of unity; for the sense of a great Colony will awaken many a thoughtful Englishman to the value of solid fusion.

I am far from desiring to cool the ardour of the patriotic and gifted men who are labouring on this supreme problem; all I deprecate is the expectation that it can be solved otherwise than by the innumerable wants, the manifold situations, the growth of powerful feelings, which distinguish man's social and moral nature in this world.

*March 2.*

---

## LETTER XIV.

*From the* DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

INDIA AND REPRESENTATION FOR BRITISH RACE ONLY—WHAT WORK THE FEDERAL COUNCIL IS TO DO—RELATIONS OF MINISTERS—DISTINCT DEPARTMENTS—SOME RESPONSIBLE TO PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM, OTHERS TO FEDERAL COUNCIL.

ALLOW me to offer a few remarks in reply to the letter of 'Colonus.'

One of his objections to a 'Federal Council' is that the claim of India to representation in it would make its numbers unwieldy. I do not see that India must necessarily be represented in a grand council of the British race. I think it is only British communities that have a positive claim to such representation. When we are satisfied that the Indian races are sufficiently identified in feeling and national sentiment with us, it may be wise to give them a share in the government of the Empire. But at present the system of government in that country is more that of a dependency, and consequently a possession of every man who is British-born, wherever he may reside, so long as he is a British subject. When he throws off his allegiance he, of course, resigns his claims.

'Colonus' sees very little that a Federal Council could do. I certainly do not suppose that its advocates

consider that it ought to deal with local taxation, railway and gas Bills, waterworks, smoke consumption, and such like ; or even compulsory education, Parliamentary representation, and matters of that higher class. But every Englishman, wherever he lives, is interested, not only in questions of peace and war, as 'Colonus' admits, but also in all treaties with foreign Powers, whether as regards customs' duties, guarantees of neutrality, or of the cession or retention of Imperial territory. But if they are all equally interested in these questions, whether they reside in the British Islands, in the Dominion of Canada, in Australasia, or in South Africa, they ought to be consulted before decisions are come to on those points ; and the best way of consulting them is to assemble their representatives at some convenient point. Their numbers need not be very great, for the factors, or constituencies, would, no doubt, be the groups into which the Colonies are geographically divided.

'Colonus' is sorely exercised about the relations between the Ministers and such a Federal Council. To what Ministry does he allude ?

The Ministers of the United Kingdom would, of course, be dependent on the support of the Parliament of Westminster. The Federal Council would have no relations with the Home Secretary, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or the Secretary for War. There would be no need of a Foreign Secretary for the United Kingdom, for 'Colonus' admits that foreign policy would be dealt with by the Federal Council, and its Committee or Secretary would administer it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer

would still have to deal with the income and expenditure of the United Kingdom, paying over such sums as might be required for the Imperial expenditure. There must still be a War Minister for the United Kingdom to look after the local forces and the contingent to be furnished to the Imperial army. A somewhat similar arrangement would probably be found advisable for the navy. And so on with respect to other departments. These Ministers of the United Kingdom would be responsible to the Parliament of the United Kingdom ; while Ministers who had to deal with Imperial questions, or had charge of Imperial funds, would be responsible to the Federal Council. And I think they would find enough to occupy their time and their ability.

*March 11.*

---

## LETTER XV.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

MOMENTOUS ISSUES OF IMPERIAL FEDERATION—A NOM DE PLUME—  
 LORD ANSON—AGREEMENT BETWEEN ‘COLONUS,’ MR. FOX, AND  
 MR. YOUNG—IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT AND NOT A ‘FEDERAL COUNCIL’  
 —QUESTIONS IT IS TO DEAL WITH—LETTER OF ‘IMPERIALIST’—  
 STATESMANLIKE SENTIMENTS—COMPLETE REPLY TO ‘COLONUS.’

**I**MPERIAL Federation involves issues far too momentous to allow those who are engaged in its discussion to be drawn into the vortex of a mere interchange of smart invectives or vituperative personalities.

‘Colonus’ intimates that I agree with Voltaire that ‘a sneer is the best argument.’ If he had read all my letters with the attention he does not appear to have done, he would have seen that I certainly have not based my case on the choice bit of Voltairism he so amiably quotes, and which, according to his own assumption, I claim as the most cogent argument I can use.

An anonymous correspondent, coming forward in opposition to those who have appeared in their true colours, and who claims the authority attaching to many years of Colonial experience, cannot be surprised at my desiring to induce him to unveil himself, and to abandon his incognito, in order to bring his opinions to the test



of their true value, when they are opposed to those of men of undoubted Colonial weight and influence, who are discussing this great question in their real names.

As, however, he says he chooses, from motives of modesty, to write under a *nom de plume*, by all means let him continue to do so, although it inevitably entails on him the disadvantage, always attaching to the unknown, of having the weight of his opinions challenged and doubted, for they may be only those of one, of whom, with all his boasted Colonial experience, it might be said, as it was of Lord Anson, that he had 'sailed round the world three times, but never was in it.'

'Colonus' says he suspects that between Mr. Fox and himself 'there will be little real difference.' Can there be a more highly satisfactory admission than this to me? In his letter which appears in your columns of the 5th of February last, Mr. Fox says, 'Mr. Young and myself are quite agreed;' 'Our views are, I believe, identical.' If, therefore, there is little 'real difference' between Mr. Fox and 'Colonus,' and if Mr. Fox's views and mine 'are identical,' it logically follows, then, after all, that 'Colonus' and I are also agreed, in spite of our apparent divergencies.

I think I have here made a perfectly fair and legitimate use of the admissions so naïvely avowed by 'Colonus' in the passage I have quoted. I am bound, however, to add that many of the remarks which he subsequently makes do not at all coincide with the apparently harmonious agreement between us, and are, in fact, entirely contradictory to it. But it is for 'Colonus,' not me, to

explain the dilemma in which he has undoubtedly placed himself.

And now I must once more repeat that the idea of Imperial Federation, such as I have contemplated, is not at all embraced in the term which 'Colonus' makes use of, viz., a 'Federal Council.' The thirty years' Colonial experience so highly vaunted by 'Colonus' may possibly have been gained under the shade of the blighting influence and dull atmosphere of a Crown colony, limiting his ideas to the narrow notions engendered by the necessity of regarding all theories of government as primarily proceeding from the traditions of the Colonial Office in Downing Street. Or probably he may have witnessed the beginnings only of one of our great Colonies—those nascent nations of the future, before the Constitutions were granted to them, which have given them such free and plenary powers of legislation. My own experience having been acquired in a freer atmosphere and on a broader platform, I say distinctly I do not desire any of them to abdicate one jot or one tittle of the powers already conferred upon them, by any scheme of Imperial federation. The Assembly which 'Colonus' speaks of, as 'sitting in London,' would not be, as he says, a 'Federal Council,' but, as I assert, an Imperial Parliament.

And now let me assure him, he is quite mistaken in thinking that I have not thought out my subject. It is, however, abundantly clear that 'Colonus' is incapable of embracing a political idea so vast and grand as the one I have ventured to propound. With pertinacious volubility he asks a variety of questions, which, *more suo*, he answers

in the same breath, supremely, I doubt not, to his own satisfaction. He will, however, find, that I have already put forward the outlines of a plan for an Imperial Parliament—not a ‘Federal Council’—in a distinct and definite shape. No abdication is there contemplated of any of the powers belonging to the Colonial Legislatures, any more than the least interference is suggested on the part of the Colonial representatives of an Imperial Assembly in questions either English, Irish, or Scotch. As all these latter would continue to be under the control, as heretofore, of the English Parliament; no question on the subject of ‘Home Rule’ would arise in consequence. Much as he evidently desires it, I still adhere to my intention of not gratifying my anonymous antagonist by telling him in detail what questions are to be dealt with by the Imperial Parliament. As they are those which would affect the whole British nation, in its united and corporate capacity, they are, I should think, tolerably obvious.

In reply, however, to the final one of his long string of questions, I do not hesitate to say that India would not be included in the proposed Imperial Parliament. As her inhabitants are not of the British race, the representation of this portion of the Empire—as it is already—would require to be specially and exceptionally provided for.

From the contracted views and carping criticisms of ‘Colonus,’ puzzling himself over small details, and utterly unable to embrace the idea of a great principle, it is refreshing to turn to the grand sonorous sentences of the noble letter of ‘Imperialist.’ What a striking and vivid contrast! We have here, indeed, the pleasant ring of the

lucid and loyal language of one, who is large-minded enough to comprehend the true spirit of the Imperial sentiment. The power to grasp a subject so lofty is now presented to us. The ideas expressed are those in which the profound thoughts of the philosopher, the glowing ardour of the patriot, and the experienced wisdom of the historian, are happily blended. We are made to feel, all of us, both in the Mother-country and in the Colonies, that, together, we constitute one great Empire.

While 'Colonus' is perpetually challenging me—as being an essential ingredient of the question—to discuss all its details, even to the most minute, before the principle is recognised, which I, on the contrary, contend is the first thing to be attained, 'Imperialist' is condemning in no doubtful language the attempt to devise the exact organisation which so great a problem is to take, and which he considers, like myself, to be premature, unnecessary, and altogether a mistake.

Concurring heartily as I do in the comprehensive views and thoroughly statesmanlike sentiments of 'Imperialist,' which he has clothed in the eloquent and spirit-stirring language so worthy of the grand and noble theme his trenchant pen has handled with such acute vigour and persuasive power, I commend his arguments to the sceptical 'Colonus,' as containing a complete and exhaustive refutation of the objections he raises, and as affording an ample reply to the questions on which he is desirous of eliciting an answer from me.

*March 16.*

## LETTER XVI.

*From 'A CONSTANT READER.'*

'COLONUS' AND THE DISCUSSION—ITS RISE AND PROGRESS—PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH—TROUBLES IN NEW ZEALAND—ERRONEOUS USE OF THE WORD 'COUNCIL,' INSTEAD OF 'FEDERAL PARLIAMENT'—EDWARD WILSON—CANNON STREET MEETINGS, AND WESTMINSTER CONFERENCE—E. JENKINS, M.P.—F. P. LABILLIERE—'EMPIRE' OR 'NO EMPIRE'—LETTERS OF 'PHILO-COLONUS' AND 'H. DE B. H.'—MR. YOUNG AND MR. FOX—MISCONCEPTION OF 'COLONUS'—IRISH HOME RULE NOT NECESSARY—IMPERIUM IN IMPERIO VERSUS THE HISTORY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

'COLONUS' evidently entered into the discussion in your columns without reading the earlier parts of the correspondence, and without knowledge of previous discussions on Imperial Federation; for, were he familiar with that question, he would not have indulged in so many interrogatories and suggestions respecting possible or impossible contingencies.

Having followed with deep interest and close attention the discussion of England's future relations with her Colonies, which has culminated in the consideration of the great policy of Confederation, I propose to sketch the rise and progress of the discussion.

After the letters of Professor Goldwin Smith, people who did not share his sympathies naturally asked themselves how the separation which he predicted and

advocated could be avoided, and the incomparable materials for constructing a grand future empire utilised, instead of being shattered and scattered. This was the great question. The withdrawal of the troops from the Colonies, and the troubles in New Zealand ten years ago, enhanced the anxiety of the friends of a united Empire. No one then suggested any better Imperial organisation than a Council, that of India being the model. And here may I express regret that decided Imperial Federalists like the Duke of Manchester should still use the word Council whilst advocating what really would be a Federal Parliament.

Whilst ideas had not advanced beyond an Indian Council and the sending of a few Colonial members to be lost in the crowd of the House of Commons, two important discussions on Colonial relations took place at the end of 1869, the one at the Social Science Congress at Bristol, and the other at the now historical Cannon Street meetings. No less than five papers are reported in the 'Transactions' of the Bristol Congress, by Messrs. Gorst, Hare, Noble, Labilliere, and Macfie; but none of them, nor did any subsequent speaker, advocate Imperial Confederation, though it was felt that the Empire was growing to require some system of representation of all its communities for common purposes. A few weeks later came, thanks to Mr. Edward Wilson, the Cannon Street Meetings; and it was soon apparent that they had struck a severe blow at the disintegrationists who, by a policy of silence and 'masterly inaction,' hoped that England and the Colonies might gradually drift asunder.

Those meetings, though of incalculable benefit in arousing a powerful feeling for unity, presented no practical plan of organisation, such as is required to turn to account that noble sentiment as a means of giving us the strength, security, and cohesion of a united nationality.

At length appeared—and it is only right that every man's part in such a discussion should be duly acknowledged—an article entitled 'Imperial Federation' from Mr. E. Jenkins in the 'Contemporary Review' for January 1871. It is now only possible to mention the occasions when Confederation was discussed, but scarcely to glance at what was said on each. The gist of Mr. Jenkins's argument was that a Federal Parliament should be for the management of Imperial affairs, local concerns being completely left to the control of the Provincial Governments. He pointed out that in the previous session of the English Parliament out of 293 Acts passed 48 were Imperial—such as would be within the jurisdiction of a Confederate Parliament, for which 'Colonus' seriously tells us there would be nothing to do. Mr. Jenkins indicates the questions with which this Parliament would have to deal, but does not enter into the details of its constitution.

The next discussion was that at the Westminster Conference on July 20, 1871, published in 'Discussions on Colonial Questions,' when Mr. Labilliere read a paper on 'Imperial and Colonial Federalism,' entering more into detail. He advocated the direct choice of the members of the Imperial Parliament by the people, not by the Provincial Parliaments, of the different portions of the

Empire, and urged that that body should be sufficiently numerous, as the Federal Executive would have to be selected from it.

Next comes the paper of Professor Thorold Rogers in the Cobden Clubs Essays for 1871-72, pronouncing Imperial Federation impossible on account of the shortsightedness of the English Parliament in preferring petty provincial questions rather than those of Imperial consequence. Professor Rogers, however, bears important testimony to the fact that the distance and the separation by oceans of the different parts of the Confederation would be no obstacle to its maintenance.

The great question was again before the Social Science Congress at Devonport in October, 1872, when Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Labilliere both read papers advocating Confederation, which met with a favourable reception from the meeting; the former entering more into details than he had before done. At the end of the year appeared also an article in 'Fraser's Magazine,' 'Empire or no Empire,' ably supporting the policy. The colonial experience of the author, a Victorian of twenty years' standing, may well be weighed against that of 'Colonus.'

You, sir, from time to time, in leading articles, have dealt with this great question both directly and incidentally, and have done great service in maturing its discussion. I will only refer to the able correspondence in your columns in January, February, and March, 1873, in which 'Philo-Colonus' and 'H. de B. H.' discuss the possibilities of the formation of a great British Union; the latter, I think, as you point out in an article of March 21, success-



fully establishing the affirmative. Imperial Federation was again brought before public notice at the Glasgow meeting of the Social Science Congress in October 1874 by the paper of the late Mr. Eddy, which was also subsequently read at the Colonial Institute, and, together with that of Mr. Labilliere on 'The Permanent Unity of the Empire,' gave rise to an important discussion in January 1875.

In all these discussions the details of Confederation have been more or less considered, as they have been by Mr. Young and Mr. Fox in the correspondence still open in your columns. Mr. Labilliere, in a letter in your issue of December 11, specially deals with them, answering by anticipation many of the questions of 'Colonus,' who, had he given some thought and reading to this subject before venturing to write about it, would not have fallen into the grave mistakes he has made, or treated it in such a jaunty, superficial style. He would have found that the general details—the minute ones do not at present require consideration—have been sufficiently discussed, and are well known, Confederation being an existing form of government in full working order in more countries than one. We have only, therefore, to adopt this principle of dealing in our Empire with the same large questions which are under the control of existing Federal Governments, and the details will afterwards be easily adjusted.

'Colonus' utterly misconceives the nature of Federal government, when he says that the 'Colonial legislatures' would have to 'abdicate their powers, and delegate them to an Assembly sitting in London' and that 'the Peerage

and Commons of the United Kingdom ' would have to do the same. In order to ensure the *maximum* of security and strength which any power can possibly attain at a *minimum* of cost to the whole British people, the present Parliament of England and those of the Colonies would only have to hand over to a joint Executive and Legislature, in which all portions of the Empire would be fairly represented, the management of their common defences, and necessarily of their foreign policy. Of course, a power of raising revenue from all parts of the Empire would be involved in extending federal representation to them; and whether or not the Imperial Constitution should limit the power of the Imperial Parliament in raising revenue, it is certain that the amount of taxation, for defence and diplomatic purposes, which the people of this country and of every colony would have to pay to the Imperial exchequer, would be infinitely smaller than they would have to contribute for the same purposes to their own separate governments should they set up completely on their own account.

' Colonus ' endeavours to prejudice Imperial Confederation by alleging that if it were adopted Home Rule must be conceded to Ireland. This argument has more than once been disposed of in discussions, as well as in leading articles in your paper. There is such a thing as too much, as well as too little, machinery of government. One Executive and Legislature is ample for governing territories so contiguous as those of the United Kingdom; and it is only when territories are as vast as those of the United States or distant like those of the British Empire,

that separate Executives and Legislatures for provincial government become necessary and a Federal Parliament and Executive indispensable, unless the nationality is to be broken up into a number of weak fragments instead of maintaining its strength and prestige as a great united Power.

'Colonus' amuses himself by calling this policy of conserving the British Empire 'a plan for revolutionising the world,' although it only amounts to the application upon a larger scale than any upon which it has yet been tried, of the practical, well-known system of Federal government; and why should that system not be still further successful in maintaining the union of our great British nationality? He also asks, respecting our proposed British Confederated Parliament, 'Has such an *imperium in imperio* ever been read of in history?'—a question which must be answered by another—Has your extremely interrogative correspondent ever read the history of Federal government?

*March 24.*

---

## LETTER XVII.

*From ' COLONUS.'*

MR. YOUNG AND BANTER—PRINCIPLE OR DETAILS, WHICH FIRST?—  
 POWERS OF IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT, OR FEDERAL COUNCIL—VOLUN-  
 TEER FORCES—SYDNEY HARBOUR—' CERBERUS ' AT MELBOURNE—  
 TAXES AND TARIFFS—AUSTRALIA REMOVED FROM ALL CHANCE OF  
 INVASION—COLONIAL PARLIAMENTS AND FRESH TAXATION—WHAT  
 KIND OF REPRESENTATIVES WOULD THE COLONIES SEND?—CANDOUR  
 AND COURTESY OF THE DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

**A**LREADY I have experienced one inconvenience from adopting a *nom de plume*. Somebody else, in writing last week to the 'Standard,' has taken the same unpretending appellation. I merely wish to add that I do not know who he is and do not agree with his views.

Mr. Young evidently does not enjoy the banter, which he was the first to adopt in his letter of February 16, so I am content to drop it, and to agree with him that personalities should not be indulged in. How much of his last letter (March 16) would then have to be omitted it is not for me to say.

I am sorry that he declines to discuss practical difficulties 'until the principle is conceded.' Who does he wish to concede it? The way to secure its adoption is to prove that it is practicable. The chief difficulties of the question consist of details, and whoever can point

these out and suggest the best means for their removal will do more to forward this proposal than others who merely indulge in generalities and write in 'grand sonorous sentences.'

The confederation of the Empire was for years the dream of my life, and it was only when I was reluctantly forced to the conclusion that it would not work I was compelled to give it up.

Mr. Young has unintentionally answered my question, the keystone of the whole argument, so far as it has gone, viz. : What questions could possibly be discussed in what he calls the Imperial Parliament, but which I prefer to term the Federal Council, to avoid confusion with an existing and time-honoured institution. He says that 'the Colonial Legislatures are not to surrender one jot or one tittle of their present powers.' As all questions except those of Imperial defence and foreign relations are now entrusted to those Parliaments, it necessarily follows that these, and these alone, are the subjects which, according to him, could possibly be dealt with.

Even on these matters the powers of the local Legislatures are now extensively employed, as witness the establishment of large volunteer forces, the batteries defending Sydney harbour, and the ironclad 'Cerberus' at Melbourne. Military protection has been withdrawn, from our chief Colonies during peace. They have, as I said, established their local forces. If this is not to be interfered with, the intervention of the Federal Council must be limited to the case of foreign war. Is it likely that the Colonies will consent to a general system of taxation for

such a remote and problematical advantage? 'Credat Judæus non ego.'

The Home Government cannot even bind the Colonies by commercial treaties with other nations. This right could not be yielded to the Federal Government without sacrificing one of the most valued rights of the Colonies, viz. the enactment of tariffs. As nearly all revenues arise from import duties, it would amount to an abandonment of their chief fiscal powers, their most cherished possession, which Canada and Australia have so misused by their establishment of protection.

I have laid much stress on this point because, if there is very little with which the Federal Council could deal, there can be little use in this discussion. This is the basis of the question, and until this is settled the argument reminds us of the philosopher of Laputa, who proposed to build a house from the roof down to the foundation.

I deeply honour the feelings and efforts of those who wish to preserve the unity of the Empire. Let them remember

How nations sink by daring schemes oppressed,  
When vengeance listens to the fool's request.

I see in these well-intended and amiable wishes for closer confederation a very serious danger. If a Colony, in case of a war, in which probably it would have no direct interest, finds that, in addition to the ruin of its trade from foreign cruisers, it has to meet a sudden demand of a million for charges which they never were asked for heretofore, I do not say that the result would be separa-

tion, but clearly the possibility of it would be much increased.

This feeling would more probably arise in Australasia than elsewhere. It is practically removed from all chance of invasion; but its rich trade would be jeopardised in every part of the world.

Another serious consideration arises. If such a demand were made, and the Colonial Parliament simply declined to impose fresh taxation, how could it be enforced? The Imperial Government would be absolutely without resource unless it invoked the 'ultima ratio regum;' but alas for the 'unity of the Empire!'

But if I am wrong in my fears, there are still a few questions which I should like to present to the thoughtful for consideration. I will not answer them myself, or Mr. Young might attack me for the third time for answering my own questions, *more meo*. Perhaps they may form the matter of another letter.

What sort of men would the Colonies send home as their representatives? Their best men are not elected to their local Parliaments. It is found necessary to pay members to sit in an assembly which deals with the property and dearest interests of all concerned.

Could they find men of education and ability to make an annual tour to England, and, if they could find them, would they elect them? Should we be lucky enough to have 'the lucky nugget-finder or fleecer of a thousand flocks,' a respectable and rich retired publican, an honest lumber-cutter or rail-splitter, or should we have the trading politician, who has made the term a byeword of re-

proach in America? Would there be no danger of 'log-rolling' (if there were anything to roll a log about) in an assembly of men with no interests in common except the 'Imperial idea'? Would such a body, unacquainted with each other, ignorant of English statesmen, untutored in foreign politics, few of them in the habit of reading English newspapers—'a fortuitous concourse of atoms'—be likely to prove a wise deliberative assembly?

The remarks of the Duke of Manchester, opening up, as they do, a new branch of the subject, merit a letter to themselves, which I can scarcely have ready for your present number. Meanwhile, I can only thank him for the candour and courtesy with which he has answered my questions—qualities which have always distinguished him. His high rank, the interest which he always has exhibited in our Colonial Empire, the fact that he has personally visited several portions of it, give a weight to his opinions, and would make me sorry to differ with his views. In any case, I can feel sure of a candid and fair discussion with him.

*March 25.*

---



## LETTER XVIII.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

COMMON BASIS WITH 'COLONUS' IMPOSSIBLE—REASON FOR PRIMARY RECOGNITION OF PRINCIPLE—WIDE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FEDERAL COUNCIL AND IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT—NO SURRENDER PROPOSED OF COLONIAL POWERS—PERFECT EQUALITY BETWEEN COLONIES AND EMPIRE AT HOME CONTENTED FOR—AUSTRALIA AND HER RISK OF INVASION—'COLONUS' ON COLONIAL REPRESENTATIVES ANSWERED.

THERE is evidently such a wide divergence between 'Colonus' and myself as to the mode in which the principle of Imperial Federation should be discussed that a common basis between us appears to be hopeless.

No wonder the idea of the Confederation of the Empire, which, he says, 'was for years the dream of his life,' was given up by 'Colonus' in despair. The whole scope of his mind appears to render him unfit for the conception of such a task. He possesses such an aptitude for seeing difficulties, which he does not seem to have the courage to attempt to grapple with, and to overcome, that I am not in the least surprised to learn the conclusion to which he says he has come. He meets 'lions in his path' at every step, from whom he runs away. I wish I could help him to remove them.

But while I hope that the bulk of my enlightened and thoughtful fellow-countrymen will ultimately be con-

vinced of the inestimable benefits, such a Federation, as I, and others are advocating, will bring to the whole British people—and it is to them (wherever they are in the vast range of the whole Empire) to whom our appeal is made, and of whom the concession, first, of the principle we contend for is invited—I confess I am not sanguine of being able to persuade those narrow-minded local politicians, who everywhere abound, and of whom we have quite as prominent examples in the mother-country as in the Colonies themselves.

The reason for demanding the primary recognition of the principle of the desirability of Imperial Federation from the whole nation is obvious. It has already in this correspondence been effectively put forward in a few expressive words by Mr. Fox. He says—‘If it is the right thing to be done, there must be some conceivable way of doing it.’ But it embarrasses the preliminary consideration of the question, to discuss all its details with ungenerous, querulous, and hostile critics, who are not bent on helping to assist in the solution of practical difficulties by suggesting means for their removal, but on denouncing the principle *in limine*, by challenging the supporters of Federation to meet at once every objection thus started, even to points of the minutest description. All these might be met, and, one by one, perfectly smoothed away by a spirit of mutual concession, of comprehensive intelligence, and of determination to overcome them, such as would be fostered by the firm persuasion of the national benefits to be derived from the accomplishment of an idea so great and patriotic.

'Colonus' still continues to press forward the name which, he says, he prefers to call a Federal Council, but which I insist is to be an Imperial Parliament. Here is one of the wide differences between us. He does not appear to perceive that I demand a reconstruction of 'the existing and time-honoured institution,' for which, however, I entertain as much pride and admiration as he does himself. But I say the whole idea of the plan of our Home Parliament requires to be changed, in consequence of the growth and expansion of the Empire. We must have a 'local' Parliament in this country, whose functions would be limited to the legislation of home matters, exactly as the Colonial Parliaments deal with their own internal affairs. Outside this, and above this, the Imperial Parliament, composed of representatives in due proportion from the whole Empire, would govern, guide, and regulate all the questions which would come within the scope and category of Imperial legislation.

And here I must protest against the use 'Colonus' has made of my admission that it is not intended that 'Colonial legislatures should surrender one jot or one tittle of their present powers.' This (in answer to his own previous question whether they were to be asked to do so) was intended to convey the idea that they would be regarded simply as entering into a perfectly equal and independent partnership with the mother-country; and that under a system of fair representation, forming one compact body of the entire nation, all rights and privileges accorded to the Colonies would be conceded to them, just as if they were a part of the Empire at home. The

principle contended for throughout is clearly and purely one of perfect equality, without any distinction being made in the general governmental relations of the whole Empire.

Hence it follows that all those points which seem to trouble 'Colonus' so sorely, like 'the batteries defending Sydney harbour,' and the ironclad 'Cerberus' at Melbourne, will have no place. It is scarcely the part of one who takes a comprehensive survey of the prospects of the remote future to assert, as he so confidently does, for instance, that Australasia is practically removed from all risks of invasion or chances of engaging in war. What does he imagine may be, some day, the condition of all these vast regions of the world, when a teeming population of our own countrymen has not only peopled this immense and magnificent continent, but when numerous growths of civilised inhabitants, not only of our own, but of perhaps other European nations also, have populated the beautiful and genial groups of islands of the Pacific Ocean? Until the blessed period of the millennium has arrived does he not think there are chances, aye, and certainties too, of disputes arising among mankind, especially among those of different race and nation? Will it therefore be so certain that Australasia will remain always as secure as he thinks from war, and not be absolutely compelled to undertake costly works to defend her coasts, and provide naval and military establishments to protect her from invasion in case of those contingencies arising, the possibility of which happening

to her she will some day be compelled very gravely to contemplate.

This is a form of treating the question which presents a wide scope for the consideration of our fellow-countrymen in Australasia, but which 'Colonus' does not seem able to comprehend. It will afford them opportunity for seriously reflecting whether, in point merely of expense, apart altogether from the question of the noble sentiment of the union of a great nationality in an Imperial Federation) it would not be far less costly to remain an integral part of one great Empire, and equitably to contribute to the cost which its necessities demand for Imperial defence and protection, than, as an independent nation, to be obliged to undertake by itself the overwhelming expenses of defence, which inevitably must be entailed on every great and powerful civilised community, once separated from an imperial partnership. This union it is contended on every account ought never to be dissolved between us.

Again, I readily reply to the question of 'Colonus' as to the 'sort of men the Colonies would send home as their representatives,' about whom he seems much concerned, and towards whom he is by no means kind or complimentary. I confess I have no anxiety on this point, nor do I think there would be the slightest difficulty in finding the 'best men' to become representatives in an Imperial Parliament. It would become an object of laudable ambition for them to be representatives in such an Assembly, and no true analogy can be drawn from the example cited of the men now elected to the various local Parliaments.

In spite of his sneer I would point to the long roll of illustrious names which America has sent from time to time to represent her, as her ambassadors to Europe, as well as to those no less distinguished individuals which our largest Colonies are in the habit of selecting as their Agents-General in England, as proving conclusively that this is only another of the 'hobgoblins' which the inventive brain of 'Colonus' is bent on conjuring up, to endeavour to obscure, mystify, and embarrass the straightforward consideration of a deeply anxious and important question, involving the vital interests, because the permanent cohesion and ultimate destiny of the British Empire. Let me assure him that I entirely endorse all he says about the Duke of Manchester, who, by the way, has already expressed his general concurrence with my views, and consequently his opposition to those of 'Colonus.' Whether he has himself altogether followed his Grace's example may perhaps be open to question. With him he is certain, no doubt, to have a 'fair and candid discussion.' Does he think, because I have been obliged now and then to address him a little more severely—I trust not uncourteously—he has not had precisely the same fairness and candour from me?

*April 12.*

---

## LETTER XIX.

*From* 'COLONUS.'

THE DUKE OF MANCHESTER AND SUBJECTS FOR THE FEDERAL COUNCIL  
—DEFINITION OF 'A CONSTANT READER'—E. G. WAKEFIELD'S  
'ART OF COLONISATION'—PEACE AND WAR, AND FOREIGN TREATIES  
—MOTIVES OF MEN TO ENTER PUBLIC LIFE—IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT  
OUGHT TO BE SUPERIOR TO ENGLISH GOVERNMENT—UNNATURAL  
ARRANGEMENT—FOREIGN SECRETARY—TAXING POWERS—COMPLICA-  
TION OF DIVIDED RESPONSIBILITY—SUEZ CANAL—ROYAL TITLES  
BILL—TWO BUDGETS—NO ANALOGY IN HISTORY FOR SUCH A  
SYSTEM OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

THE Duke of Manchester having courteously replied to my questions as to what subjects could be legislated upon in a Federal Council of the Empire, I should hope for a further contribution from him in explanation of some other difficulties which I foresee. I had rather expected to have found in him an advocate in favour of a Council of Advice like the Council of India, as suggested in my first letter of February 5, inasmuch as in his letter of December 27 he advised the appointment of a similar body as the best practical step at present.

His Grace proposes as subjects for the Federal Council :—

1. Questions of peace and war.
2. Treaties with foreign powers relative to customs

duties and guarantees of neutrality or cession of territory.

'A Constant Reader' defines the function of this Council as 'the management of common defences, and necessarily of foreign policy.' These certainly do involve an abdication of some of the rights of the English Parliament, and is all I ever meant by that assertion.

In my former letters I pointed out why the Colonies never could or would allow a Federal Government the right to make treaties as to customs duties. This would deprive them of the power to regulate their own revenues, which almost entirely consist of import duties, and would also interfere with the regulation of their whole fiscal policy. To grant this would clearly be an abdication of their present powers, although Mr. Young says that they 'should not surrender one jot or one tittle of them.' As all powers on every possible subject are now divided between the Imperial and local Legislatures, I would submit to 'A Constant Reader' that the functions of the Federal Council must be, if I may so say, carved out of those now exercised by one or other of the existing bodies. This is all I ever meant by saying that his plan involved an abdication of some of their powers, which appears to me to be merely a logical and inevitable conclusion so plain, that I really felt it unnecessary to prove it. Far be it from me to argue that such a mutual surrender might not be desirable; on the contrary, I believe that if, before Constitutions were granted to the various Colonies, large Imperial powers had been reserved, it would have been better for the Colonies themselves. This



was the view taken by Mr. Gibbon Wakefield in his 'Art of Colonisation.' All I contend for is, that the sweets of power having been once tasted by the Colonies, they will not consent to surrender them. If so, there must be an end to the proposal to confederate.

Treaties as to the cession of territory no doubt would be legitimate topics ; but, after all, when did England ever cede territory except in the instance of the Orange River in South Africa ? No doubt a great mistake was then made, which probably might not have been obviated by a Federal Council. It is true that a similar step was lately proposed by the present Ministry, and was frustrated by the Imperial Parliament as effectually as it could have been by a Federal Council. I allude, of course, to the proposed cession of the Gambia. Is it essential to guard against a danger which has only occurred once in history, and which is every year less probable to occur ? If such a proposal were made, it would interest the people of England much more than the Colonists. The trade of the Gambia is more necessary to Manchester than to Canada or Australia. The Imperial Parliament is more interested, less likely to consent, and is a better judge in such a case than a Federal Council would be.

Questions of peace and war and foreign treaties are no doubt most important ; but surely his Grace need not be reminded that these are not matters for *legislation* at all ; that they are acts of prerogative of the Crown, directed by responsible Ministers ; and that it is only by placing a Foreign Secretary in power who has the confi-

dence of the people that public opinion indirectly controls the foreign policy of the Empire. Let us therefore consider whether, under the proposed system, public opinion would have the same influence, and whether it would have the same field from which to select statesmen to guide it. I would remark, *en passant*, that it is now pretty clear that the only subjects on which the Federal Council could actually *come to a vote* would be the army and navy estimates. These might be subjects for debate ; but whether the constituencies of the United Kingdom and the Colonies would care to be represented in an assembly of such limited powers, or whether they could persuade their best men to go there, is a matter for grave reflection. I much fear that it would be difficult, even in England, to find eligible men to sit there—still more so to induce good men from the Colonies to make an annual visit to this country to debate on what concerns them very little, viz. on Foreign Policy, and possibly to give a vote on what does not concern them at all, inasmuch as few, if any, are left in our principal settlements.

Whatever motives impel men to enter public life, whether zeal for religion, education, or philanthropy, whether ambition is the object, or the more ignoble hopes of place or promotion are the inducements, all would direct the candidate to the British House of Commons.

The peer whose wish is to aggrandise his family or to maintain his social position, would neglect the Federal Council, and still spend his thousands on his county election. The barristers seeking a seat on the bench, the

embryo Lord Chancellors, Attorney-Generals, &c. of the day would all turn to the House of Commons. The Federal Council would be the *Parliamentum indoctum* of history which did not contain a single lawyer. Oxford and Cambridge would still be deemed to confer the blue ribands which heretofore have attracted the Peels, Palmerstons, and Gladstones, &c. I really am at a loss to guess who in England would be candidates for the Federal Council, unless those described by Bismarck as 'the philosophers,' and whom he deems a most objectionable class. Is it to such an assembly, composed of the mediocrities of England, supplemented by a few colonists, ignorant, as they too often are, of anything beyond their own Colony, that the foreign affairs of this Empire are to be entrusted? Is it an assembly which would command respect at home or abroad? Would these be the men to cope with the Metternichs and Lievens of the last generation or the Thiers and Bismarcks of the present?

The Imperial Government, consisting of the Federal Lords and Commons, ought to be superior in dignity, power, and estimation, both at home and abroad, to the English Government of Queen, Lords, and Commons. The greater must contain the lesser. Compare them both. The Sovereign would be common to both. The Federal House of Peers, according to Mr. Labilliere's plan (letter December 5, 1875), selected for life, some by the Crown, some by the House of Lords, reinforced by a Colonial contingent, could not surely for a moment compete with the hereditary peerage of England, with its existing pres-

tige and wealth, recruited as it is yearly by the talent, wealth, and distinction of the United Kingdom.

The Commons of England, with jurisdiction over the most important and heart-stirring subjects of the day, composed of men of strong local influence and world-wide fame, of the members for Oxford and Cambridge, the city of London, Liverpool, Manchester, Westminster, Middlesex, Edinburgh, and other seats of learning, intelligence, and opulence, would certainly outweigh in popular estimation an assembly in which some few eminent Englishmen might find seats, assisted by unknown (possibly very good) men, representing Montreal, Sydney, Cape Town, Auckland, and New Westminster; and yet, as I shall show further on, it would be possible for the Federal to override the English Government. We all know the force of popular prejudice, even when not backed by common sense. Could such an unnatural arrangement last for long?

At present our most important Minister is the Foreign Secretary. For that distinguished post the best man is selected—who has proved his ability in other offices, whose sympathies and principles are well known to his colleagues and to the public. He is a member of a Cabinet composed of former Foreign Secretaries and others who are conversant with that branch of government whose assistance and advice he has daily. In the Federal Council how is the Foreign Secretary to be trained, with whom is he to consult? The Federal Cabinet would consist of the Secretary at War, and the First Lord of the Admiralty, a Secretary for the Colonies, and

a Postmaster. Whence then could he derive that varied knowledge of each department of government by which his training is now perfected.

‘A Constant Reader’ intends that this Federal Council should have taxing powers, and it is very evident that any body which can vote 27,000,000*l.* (the amount in the estimates of this year for national defence) must have the means of raising it. His Grace, however, says ‘that the Federal Councils would have no relations with the Home Secretary, Chancellor of the Exchequer, or Secretary at War; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer would still have to deal with the income and expenditure of the United Kingdom, paying over such sums as might be required for Imperial expenditure.’ From which I infer that the Federal Council is intended to send in its bill to the United Kingdom and each Colony, who would have to raise the money.

Has it ever occurred to the advocates of this view what a complication might arise from this divided responsibility? I will take, for example, the purchase of the Suez Canal, as it happens to be the question of the day. I might point out much stronger instances.

The Federal Council determines, most wisely in my opinion, to effect the purchase, and negotiates in the same speedy and efficacious manner as we have experienced, and transmits a demand for England’s share of the purchase-money. Imagine, as might easily have been the case, that Mr. Gladstone, who gives twenty-four reasons in his Syllabus to prove the disastrous nature of the bargain, to be in power in the English House of Commons, backed

there by the whole rank and talent of England, who support his view. Suppose he received a demand for nearly 4,000,000*l.* for a purpose which he denounces, and has to upset his Budget and all his financial plans at the behest of a body whom he and the House of Commons probably despise and sneer at. He has then to bring forward taxation which he confesses to be unnecessary, and for an injurious object. Would it be possible for him to carry such a Budget, especially in the face of a powerful Opposition? He would have to resign, ousted by the Federal Council, whilst possessing the confidence of the House of Commons and England. These scenes might be repeated in every Colony which received a similar demand: a sense of decency might restrain the House of Commons; but imagine such a bombshell falling in Melbourne during a 'stonewall crisis,' or a 'deadlock,' what chance would there be of obtaining the money, and how could it be enforced? The most insignificant Colony, by a masterly inactivity, could checkmate the whole Empire.

A similar embroglio would have arisen in this other question of the present Session, the Royal Titles Bill. The Federal Council and the Colonies would probably support the proposed title of Empress, as was evidenced by the action of the Royal Colonial Institute. The people of England seem to be very decidedly adverse to the proposed change. If it had been introduced at any time when a Liberal Ministry were in power (which is usually the case) it would have been unquestionably rejected by the House of Commons. My own feelings in both these instances would be with the supposed action of the Federal Council,

but I cannot help asking myself, as in this our present Session the only two measures of importance might have caused collision, whether it would be possible to maintain this dual system of Government. Of the six estates of the realm, the Sovereign would be most to be commiserated—Emperor in the Empire, King in England, bound to take the advice of his Federal Ministry, which his English Ministry may advise him is ruinous to England.

For these and other reasons I am forced to agree with ‘A Constant Reader’ that the Federal Council must have separate taxing powers extending over the whole Empire ; but then I would ask are we to have two Budgets—one Federal, the other local—enacted by separate bodies, possibly on conflicting principles—the Federal on free-trade, the local on protective principles? I presume the duties would have to be collected at each port by separate officers at double expense.

His Grace goes on to say that there ‘must still be a War Minister for England to look after the local forces and the contingent to be furnished to the Federal army.’ Is England not to be included in the scheme of Imperial defence? or is it intended that each division of the Empire should manage its own ordinary defences? Be it so ; but then it follows that the function of the Federal Council would in time of peace be confined to a few military stations, such as Gibraltar and Malta. If any thing requires to be organised under one head, surely it is the army.

‘A Constant Reader’ speaks of ‘practical well-known systems of Federal Government,’ and asks whether I have

read its history. I confess that I have not read the history of any confederation which presents any analogy to what he proposes. The nearest is that of the United States; but there the federation was the result of a war in which all were mutually engaged, it took place in the infancy of the States, and grew with their growth. In its result it has had to be welded together with an amount of 'blood and iron' which is not encouraging. Reflecting men think that it cannot last, its over-bulk will break it into at least three divisions, although it is all on one continent, bound together by its noble rivers and gigantic railways. We, on the other hand, are scattered over every region of the globe, divided by 'melancholy oceans,' with a sparser population but larger territory. Canada is too recent in its formation to be cited as a proved success, and I entirely decline to accept such a case as that of Austria and Hungary, which has never stood the strain of any disaster.

I have already so far trespassed upon your space that I must reserve some observations for another letter.

*April 13.*

---



## LETTER XX.

*From 'A CONSTANT READER.'*

UNSUBSTANTIAL APPREHENSIONS OF 'COLONUS'—SUBJECT OF FEDERATION TREATED AT LENGTH—CONFUSION OF IDEAS—WRONG NAMES—GREAT INACCURACY—ROYAL COLONIAL INSTITUTE—HISTORY OF CONFEDERATION NOT STUDIED BY 'COLONUS'—POSSIBLE AND IMPOSSIBLE SYSTEMS—REPUDIATION OF FEDERAL COUNCIL—HOPE MR. YOUNG WILL REST SATISFIED.

**H**OW the unsubstantial apprehensions of 'Colonus' must dissolve on the slightest investigation is remarkably exhibited in the following instance. In his last letter he says:—'All I ever meant by the assertion'—made by him in your columns on March 4—about 'the Peerage and Commons of the United Kingdom abdicating their functions,' and 'the Colonial Legislatures doing the same,' is that 'the management of common defences, and necessarily of foreign policy, certainly does involve an abdication of some of the rights of the English Parliament.' Instead of the sweeping assertion about abdicating 'their functions,' his mild expression now is 'some of the rights.' Does 'Colonus,' in his innocence on the subject of Federation, consider such a system possible without the provincial Governments consenting to leave the direction of common defences and foreign policy to the Federal Gov-

ernment ; or does he think that the prestige of which the provincial Parliaments would thus be deprived would not be more than adequately compensated for by the greatly increased security and diminished cost which would be ensured to all the communities which should have the wisdom to enter into such a system of co-operative defence ?

We are told that 'the sweets of power having been once tasted by the Colonies, they will not consent to surrender them.' Now, how would this be affected by the chief questions with which a Confederate government would have to deal ?—foreign relations and common defence. As to the former, the Colonies have never yet tasted 'the sweets of power,' and can never do so until admitted to participate in the management of Imperial affairs by means of Confederation or, by becoming completely independent, being obliged at a great cost to establish diplomatic relations with foreign states. Neither have the Colonies yet tasted the sweets of power in respect to defence, and it will be long before they can do so if they assume positions of isolation as independent nations beside such great rising powers as the United States and Russia. Their customs duties need be no more affected by treaties made by a Federal Government than they now are by the existing treaties of the Imperial Government, and their rights to manage their own provincial fiscal arrangements as they please might easily be reserved by the Federal Constitution ; which even if it only gave very limited powers of taxation to the Federal Parliament, would still enable it to raise, from such vast

and wealthy dominions as those of our Empire, ample revenues for all Imperial purposes.

'Colonus' has not only approached this question with a confusion of ideas, but insists on discussing it with a confusion of terms. He will call things by their wrong names. He speaks of a governing body, which he admits, if it is to exist at all, must have legislative power to manage the affairs of the whole Empire, as the Federal Council—just as though it were to be something like the Indian Council, instead of a real and powerful Parliament; and in one of the most self-contradictory paragraphs ever penned, he contrasts this inferior 'Council' of the Empire with the superior Parliament of the United Kingdom. He asserts that all the men of talent and ambition would aspire to the House of Commons, and is 'at a loss to guess who in England would be candidates for the Federal Council;' which, however, most unluckily for his argument he, with amazing simplicity immediately afterwards admits, would have the management of 'the foreign affairs of this empire,' and would have to 'cope with the Metternichs and Lievens of the last generation, or the Thiers and Bismarcks of the present.' Is it possible that it never struck 'Colonus' that a Parliament—it would not be a mere Council—whose statesmen and ministers would have to transact the business of our Empire with such statesmen as he names, must consequently have great attractions for men far above 'the mediocrities of England'? In writing the name of Bismarck did he forget that that great man has become more illustrious by founding a Confederation, and as a minister in its Parlia-

ment, than he could ever have been in that of Prussia? So any minister or ministry—nay England herself—would stand in a much more imposing position in dealing with foreign nations if able to speak in the name of the Parliament of the whole united British Empire instead merely of that of these islands.

Your correspondent next brings into collision and confusion the Federal Government and that of these kingdoms in a manner which is conclusive evidence of what I said about his being unable to comprehend either the theory or practical working of existing Federal Governments. He then occupies nearly half a column in answering a sentence of the Duke of Manchester's letter—which I am sure his Grace will be disposed to reconsider—about Provincial Governments 'paying over such sums as might be required for Imperial expenditure.' I concede to 'Colonus' all he says upon that head, and leave him to thank me for nothing; or rather, I should thank him for expending his energies in exposing an impossible mode of Federation whilst the possible and practicable systems remain unaffected by his attacks.

The following is a conspicuous instance of his great inaccuracy with respect to the subject on which he writes. He says:—'The Federal Council and the Colonies would probably support the proposed title of Empress, as was evidenced by the action of the Royal Colonial Institute.' 'Colonus' has either not read the published memorial of the Institute, or has forgotten its contents. It makes no allusion whatever to the title of Empress—which had not

been announced till after it had been sent in—but only asks for recognition of the Colonies in the Royal title.

‘Colonus’ agrees with me that the Federal ‘Council’—still the wrong name!—‘must have separate taxing powers extending over the whole Empire;’ and asks a very unnecessary question as to whether there would be ‘two Budgets—one Federal, the other local,’ and whether the former would be on free-trade principles. It seems obvious that it would, because its sole object would be to raise in the simplest manner possible revenue for Imperial purposes, which would in no way interfere with the narrowest provincial policy of protection. ‘Colonus’ next troubles himself about placing a custom-house officer ‘in each port’—a minute point of detail altogether depending upon the nature of the taxes which the Federal Constitution or Parliament might provide should be levied for the purposes of Imperial revenue.

I do not see how the suggestion that the Federal army would be so small in time of peace as to need little management by the Federal Government tells against our policy. It illustrates how our union would be strength. Our naval power, which Confederation would so vastly develop, would be so effective that scarcely any land defences would be required besides local militias and volunteers.

If your correspondent had studied the history of Confederation, he would perceive that there is only one point in which the system which we advocate has no analogy to those Federal Governments which have proved

a great practical success. It would only differ in being applied on a larger scale by men alive to the value of and determined to maintain by some practical organisation the unity of our British Empire. No infamous strife-kindling policy, like that of slavery, requiring a settlement of 'blood and iron,' can ever arise to separate us; and the fact that our territories are not 'all on one continent,' but 'divided by melancholy oceans,' would enable us, whilst maintaining an effective Federal Union for Imperial purposes, to allow more provincial complete control of local affairs than is possible in the contiguous States of the American Union—in the matter of tariffs, for instance.

There are possible and impossible systems of Federal as of all other kinds of government. 'Colonus' has only been contending against the latter, to which Federalists, for the credit of their cause, are likely to be more opposed than he is himself. He can only, as a prophet, declare that the 'practical well-known system of Federal Government' will not furnish the people of our Empire, who desire to remain united, with an efficient political organisation.

The simple answer to everything that 'Colonus' has written is that all real Federalists must repudiate his totally inadequate 'Federal Council' and policy, which he has attempted to father upon them. Were his pictures at all like Imperial Federation, I for one would oppose that policy; but, far from painting likenesses, he has only been drawing grotesque caricatures. I must therefore, with all courtesy, decline further discussion with him whilst he

aims so wide of the mark or fires such light artillery at it. I hope also that Mr. Young will rest satisfied with the victories he has won for the Federal cause.

*April 20.*

---

## LETTER XXI.

*From 'COLONUS.'*

DIFFERENCE WITH MR. YOUNG—VITAL PRINCIPLES—POWER OF PUBLIC OPINION—EXAMPLE OF THE UNITED STATES CITED—OLD COUNTRIES AND NEW COLONIES—EFFICIENT AGENTS—MR. CHILDERS AND MR. JENKINS—HOW ARE MEMBERS TO BE ELECTED TO THE FEDERAL COUNCIL?—'STONEWALL' AT MELBOURNE—MR. BERRY AND SIR JAS. McCULLOCH—DISGRACEFUL SCENES IN THE HOUSE—WITH A LEGAL, THE FEDERAL COUNCIL WOULD HAVE NO REAL, POWER—MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER—NORTH AMERICAN FISHERIES—NICE EMBROGLIO.

THERE is, as Mr. Young says, a wide divergence between us as to the mode in which a discussion on Imperial Federation should be conducted. He deals in generalities, asking the British public scattered over the whole world to admit a principle which probably few would attempt to dispute if they saw their way to carry it out. It seems to me, on the other hand, desirable to

look the difficulties of the position in the face. These will not be got rid of by Mr. Young calling them 'hobgoblins,' nor by his declining all discussion of vital principles on the ground that they are 'details.' Surely the questions whether a dual government can last, whether an *imperium in imperio* can be tolerated in a well ordered state, are vital principles. Whether it would be possible to persuade the English and Colonial Parliaments to cede certain portions of their present functions, and whether the best Colonists would be sent to the Federal Council are points of importance on which the whole argument rests. What powers the Federal Council should possess is a question of detail I admit, but only in the sense in which wheels are details of a coach—if anything goes wrong with them the whole upsets.

Public opinion at home and abroad now-a-days always asserts its power. Much, therefore, would depend on the composition of the Federal Council and on the weight which therefore would be attached to its deliberation. Mr. Young says nothing as to what men in England would prefer its arena to that of their own Parliament, but believes that the best Colonists would offer themselves as candidates (I doubt it), but he gives no reason whatever for supposing that they would be elected, to which subject I shall return.

He supports his view by the example of the United States selecting good men as their Ministers at the Court of St. James. The telegrams of the last few days as to Mr. Dana's appointment show that the best man is not always sent, and that this is made a party question at



Washington. I cheerfully admit, however, that as a rule they have been, but how he draws the inference that because a comparatively old country, with 30,000,000 inhabitants, can find one man to go for a fixed period at a good salary to one of the most dignified positions in the world—*ergo*, that a new colony, with less than a million inhabitants (and no colony except Canada has so large a population), can find a number of eligible men to go round the world annually, at their own expense, to a post of (I fear) little dignity, I do not see.

Nor do I see how the other example he cites is more to the purpose—namely, that various Colonies have sent home efficient agents. Sometimes it has not been found easy to find even one man fit for the enviable and well-paid post, and Englishmen have been appointed, as in the instances of Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Childers, and others. The facts that patriotic volunteers have not offered themselves to spend and be spent for their country, that no agent has, I believe, ever yet filled the office for more than a very few years, all seem to me to point to the very reverse as the conclusion which logically follows from this experience. But granting, for the sake of argument, that numbers of the best men would aspire to political distinction, I must add, even at the risk of being called to account for discussing a detail, how are these members to be elected, as on this everything would depend. Are they to be elected by the existing constituencies? If so, what possible ground is there for hope that they would elect a different class from that which now disgraces some of our local Parliaments? Or are they to be elected by

these Parliaments? If so, they would certainly select from their own body or from some similar set. Mr. Young merely says that he 'has no anxiety about it;' I have.

In your last paper, sir, you gave the gratifying assurance that the 'stonewall' at Melbourne had finally fallen. Never was there a greater mistake. Friend and foe alike predict the speedy return of Mr. Berry to power, armed with the tremendous gagging power which Sir James Mc Culloch has so rashly given him. I ask in sober sadness what sort of men would be selected by him and his friends, or by the constituencies which had elected them. It will matter little whether we call the proposed assembly a Federal Council or an Imperial Parliament if men come to it from a House where 'the words thief, coward, liar, were freely bandied about for several hours, and where two honourable members were only restrained by the violent interposition of their friends from coming to fisticuffs in the House.' This is only an extract from columns to a similar effect which arrived by the last mail.

It may be replied that no argument can be derived from these disgraceful scenes at Melbourne that other colonies will be better conducted. Let us charitably hope so, but not be too certain. Of all our colonies, Victoria is the most British in its population, with fewest native-born inhabitants; the richest; the most concentrated; with the largest landed proprietary; with an exceptionally large amount of professional and other education imported direct from the mother-country. Yet let

us look at the result, and not forget that human nature is the same all over the globe. Let us remember that every year there is a larger colonial native-born population growing up, with less British feeling and more contracted views. Let us reflect every year, heretofore at least, there has been a deterioration in our legislative assemblies, that already, as in the United States, the best men eschew politics. Am I then unreasonable in doubting whether the best men, unknown to and entrusted by the local constituencies, would be selected by them for the Federal Council?

But, if they are not so elected, what is the inevitable consequence? The Federal Council, although with a legal, will have no real power. Weighed against the Parliament of England, it would kick the beam. I gave two instances in my last letter of measures in the present session in which it was more than probable that collisions would have occurred between the House of Commons and the Federal Council, the latter with superior legal powers in each case, but with no moral support. Since then, a third has cropped up, in which a collision would be all but certain. Marriage with a deceased wife's sister is legalised in several of our Colonies. This is, I should think, an Imperial question, although not included in the proposed powers by anyone, and would pretty certainly be made general by the Federal Council. Thus a system of what is by the majority of Englishmen considered to be grossly immoral, would be forced upon them, against the expressed will of the English Parliament, by the Federal Council, composed of such elements as are,

to say the least, possible, and therefore carrying no moral influence whatever.

This letter is already too long, or I could point out another nice embroglio relative to the North American fisheries and canals mentioned in the 'Times' and 'Standard' of this week.

*April 25.*

---

## LETTER XXII.

*From the* DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

HOPE TO SEE AN IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT ESTABLISHED—FEDERAL COUNCIL SIMILAR TO THE INDIAN COUNCIL—THE WAY TO IT—THE AUTHORITY ACQUIRED BY POWER OF VOTING MONEY—SPECIAL TAXES TO BE LEVIED FROM THE WHOLE EMPIRE—REQUIRED AMOUNT TO BE RAISED BY EACH STATE, AS IS FOUND MOST CONVENIENT.

ALLOW me to state, in answer to 'Constant Reader' and 'Colonus,' that I do hope to see the establishment of an Imperial Parliament. But I am of opinion that the most likely way to obtain it is to ask, in the first instance, only for a Federal Council similar to the Indian Council. I hold that, if such a Council has the power of

voting money, it has the means of acquiring all the authority of the House of Commons. The funds of which it might have the disposal could be raised by special taxes, levied in all portions of the Empire; but I think it would be found more convenient that each State should pay over to the Federal Government its rateable share of the amount voted by the Federal Parliament. The individual States would then have it in their power to raise the required amount in the manner found most convenient.

*May 1.*

---

### LETTER XXIII.

*From 'COLONUS.'*

APOLOGY FOR IRREGULAR MODE OF TREATING THE QUESTION—SEVERAL  
 CORRESPONDENTS TO ANSWER—'EIGHT' POSITIONS PROVED—CON-  
 FEDERATION OF GROUPS OF COLONIES A STEP TOWARDS A CON-  
 FEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE—MIGHT BE A STEP TOWARDS DIS-  
 RUPTION—CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL OF ADVICE RECOMMENDED—  
 CONCLUSION.

**I**N concluding my letters on this question I should wish  
 to apologise for the discursive, irregular manner in  
 which the matter had to be treated. This necessarily

arose from the fact that I had to answer several correspondents in one letter. It has been my aim to show, and I think that I have shown conclusively :—

1st. That the establishment of this mode of government must involve an abdication of the powers both of the English and Colonial Parliaments to so large an extent, that it was not reasonable to expect that any of these bodies would consent thereto.

2nd. That the only questions which anybody had proposed to give to the Federal Council—namely those of foreign policy and national defence, were those in which the Colonies feel little or no interest—*ergo*, that their best men would not offer themselves for election. This was fully corroborated at the last meeting of the Royal Colonial Institute by the Duke of Manchester and the Bishop of Melbourne, who both attributed the political difficulties of colonial government to the want of any class with leisure to attend to politics. If that is true of their local Parliaments, *à fortiori* it would be more impossible to find a similar class to attend to Imperial or Federal affairs.

3rd. That even if good men were found willing to leave their occupations and devote themselves to public life, there was still but very small chance that they would be elected. This is amply proved by the men elected to the local Parliaments.

4th. That as almost all subjects of great interest would still be decided in the English Parliament, and as all local distinction and power was to be won therein, it was certain that the foremost men of England would look to

that as their field for action and not to the Federal Council.

5th. That the result would therefore be an assembly of English mediocrities and Colonial nobodies—an assembly which would not command respect at home or abroad, and would therefore have no moral weight.

6th. That nevertheless the Federal Council would in some respects override the English Parliament, although the latter would be supported by public opinion.

7th. That occasions for collision would not only be probable but certain, and that this dual Government would be intolerable. Indeed it was scarcely necessary to prove that which is admitted by all—namely that an *imperium in imperio* is one of the worst of ills.

8th. That this Federal Council must possess taxing powers, but without a particle of power to enforce them, thus rendering a dissolution of the Empire probable, inasmuch as the relations of taxgatherer and taxpayer are not always amicable, and that the Colonies would be impatient of taxation for objects for which as yet they had not been taxed. It must not be forgotten that the central Government, whether Imperial or Federal or English, has now no mode whatever of enforcing (short of a war) any of her behests in any large Colony. If the local Government of the day does not wish to comply with any demand, it need not even refuse—all that need be done is to do nothing, the Imperial Government has not a soldier or policeman or revenue officer to receive a command. The Governor is the only Imperial officer, and he is constitutionally bound to his responsible ministers.

How then could any tax or contribution in any shape be reckoned on from a dependency except as 'a benevolence'?

Mr. Berry need only omit to act on a despatch, and the whole machinery for Imperial taxation would be thrown out of gear.

Not any attempt has been made to disprove any one of these positions; they have been met merely by the reply that they were details. But until these and several more are answered, I fear that the practical English mind will not be led to adopt 'an idea,' however grand, laudable, or attractive it may at first appear. I give full credit to its supporters for sincerity and patriotism, and would advise them, if they conceive their plans feasible, to continue the agitation at once. Each year the task will become more difficult. Every year adds largely to the colonial-born youth, which naturally have less reverence and affection for the mother-country than their fathers who had left its shores. This would of course continue, whether Federation were established or not, and reflecting minds may perhaps doubt whether it would be wise to try such an experiment with a constantly increasing disturbing force such as I have alluded to.

Confederation of groups of Colonies is a step, and a necessary step, towards a confederation of the Empire. It must not, however, be forgotten that it may prove a step towards disruption. A Canadian, South African, or Australian group could, if so disposed, declare their secession and nobody could attempt to coerce them. Such a proceeding by an isolated colony, Nova Scotia,



Natal, &c., would now be ludicrous. In the meanwhile, a consultative council of advice, somewhat similar to the Indian Council, might avert difficulties and misunderstandings between the mother-country and her offspring. This is what I advocated in my first letter, and I have seen no reason to alter that view.

Before concluding, I must express my regret for any remarks of mine which may have appeared discourteous or severe towards others. They need not have been irate because I pointed out some of the dangers and pitfalls which surround their proposed path. Instead of regarding me as a fellow-labourer in the cause of the unity of the Empire, some of them seemed inclined to regard me as a personal antagonist. To none do I owe any grudge. Towards my most constant assailant, Mr. Young, I entertain, in common with many other colonists, every feeling of goodwill for the indefatigable labour he has undergone in supporting the most valuable Royal Colonial Institute. If we are to meet in print again, I trust that it may be on some subject which we both understand, for in that case we shall probably both agree.

*May 6.*

---

## LETTER XXIV.

*From* FREDERICK YOUNG.

EXPEDIENT THAT THE PRESENT DISCUSSION SHOULD END—‘SIX’ ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF IMPERIAL FEDERATION SUMMARISED—DISCURSIVE STYLE OF ‘COLONUS’—ABLE REPLIES FROM THE DUKE OF MANCHESTER, MR. FOX, MR. LABILLIERE—‘IMPERIALIST’ AND ‘A CONSTANT READER’—DIPLOMATIC APPOINTMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES—FEDERATION, OR DISINTEGRATION THE ALTERNATIVE OF THE FUTURE—EMPHATIC PROTEST AGAINST THE USE OF THE TERM FEDERAL COUNCIL—QUESTION SHOULD BE DISCUSSED CALMLY, DISPASSIONATELY, AND WITHOUT PREJUDICE—THE OLD, OLD FLAG AN EMBLEM FOR ALL TIME OF THE UNITED BRITISH EMPIRE.

IT seems to me the time has come when it is expedient that the present discussion on Imperial Federation should end. When I commenced it in your columns in the month of November last, I remarked that the proper ventilation of such a subject would embrace the scope of many letters, both from myself and from your other correspondents. Well, we have now had them, and both sides of the question, on which its judgment is appealed to, have been fully and frankly placed before the British public. Its further discussion at present, in this preliminary stage of the attempt to solve a great and interesting problem, would, in my opinion, be not only tedious, but quite superfluous.

If, from what has been said on behalf of 'Imperial Federation,' our countrymen at home and in the Colonies can have been induced to perceive and admit the inestimable value of its attainment to their social, commercial, economical, and political interests, as well as to the preservation of their feelings of loyal sentiment and true patriotism, a great point will have been gained. I shall not then have the least fear of its completion, in due time, being sure to follow. All difficulties and obstacles will vanish before the determination of a free people to have what they are convinced it is for their true interests to possess, and the comprehensive power of thorough statesmanship will suggest to wise and patriotic men the means and the political machinery by which it is to be successfully and satisfactorily accomplished.

Let me very briefly remind your readers of what has been contended for on behalf of Imperial Federation.

Firstly, that considering the present rapid (as well as the certainty of the enormous future) development of our colonies, it is desirable that, as integral parts of the Empire, they should participate in the Imperial Government, and have an equitable share in the direction and control of the Imperial policy, as far as all foreign nations are concerned.

Secondly, that the best and only way in which this object can be properly effected, is in the establishment of a system of Imperial Federation, by which a Parliament would be constituted, containing representatives in due proportion from the mother-country and from the

Colonies, who should meet in England, as the common centre, and which, in its capacity of the supreme Assembly of the whole Empire, should have the power to treat and settle all subjects bearing on Imperial interests.

Thirdly, that both the mother-country and the colonies should continue to have their separate Parliaments, as heretofore; the former of which would, however, confine its legislative powers to dealing with all questions affecting home affairs only—English, Irish, and Scotch; and the latter to managing the internal affairs of its own particular colony, without any more interference with its independence and perfect freedom of action than exists at present. In fact, the idea is to make the Imperial partnership one containing a perfect principle of equitable equality between England and the Colonies.

Fourthly, that the constitution under which this Imperial Parliament would act would give to the aggregate representatives of which it would be composed the power of taxation for Imperial, but not for local purposes. The levying of taxation for these latter objects (in which would of course be included all questions relating to provincial fiscal policy) would be confined alone to the various local Parliaments.

Fifthly, that the material interests of the outlying parts of the Empire, whether as regards their protection from foreign enemies; the comparative cost of guaranteeing them such protection as they might need in future ages, when they became greater and more powerful than at present, and the promotion of their commercial and social success would all be immeasurably less onerous to them by

their continuing to remain integral portions of the British Empire, than by contemplating the possibility of becoming independent nationalities.

Sixthly, that the wonderful inventions of modern science, the constantly increasing facilities of steam navigation, and the magical powers of electric telegraphy, have really annihilated the practical difficulties connected with the question of the distance of one part of the world from another ; so that, in fact, it is easier to interchange literal and verbal communications between England and our most distant Colonies, now, than in the days of our first English Parliaments, six hundred years ago, it was to do so between the north and the south of England itself. Hence, there is no more difficulty in the present day for the Colonies to hold constant intercourse with the representatives they might delegate to an Imperial Parliament in England, than for our forefathers in Northumberland or Yorkshire formerly, to communicate with the knights of the shires they sent to represent them in a Parliament sitting at Oxford or at Westminster.

These are some of the principal points, which have been advanced by me, and confirmed by those of your correspondents who, in this discussion, have avowed themselves in favour of Imperial Federation.

In bidding farewell to 'Colonus,' to whom, however widely I am at issue with him, as to the mode in which he has treated this great question, and however little I sympathise with him in his timid reasonings in the endeavour to show that the Imperial Federation idea is 'impossible'—(that *adjective of fools*, according to the

dictum of the great military imperialist, though he was not exactly one of our type), I feel much indebted for having been the means of drawing out such able replies in your columns, from the Duke of Manchester, from 'Imperialist,' from 'A Constant Reader,' and by anticipation, from the Honourable William Fox and Mr. Labilliere.

The last letter of 'Colonus'—I trust it will be his last, for there seems to be no end to the variety of objections, his fertile brain suggests, in order to stamp out the possibility of Imperial Federation—his extremely discursive pen starting new ones, as fast as each previous one is effectually demolished and disposed of—contains a fresh crop of these, in the fullest bloom of his singularly contracted style of reasoning. Among other things he alludes to the few good men who can be selected for important diplomatic appointments by the United States. Passing over the grave and unjustifiable insult thus conveyed towards this great and noble country, by this imputation, as well as the equally unwarrantable one he makes towards our Colonies, in answer to my illustration of the distinguished individuals selected by them as their agents-general in this country, I confess to my astonishment at his inability to cast even a cursory glance into the womb of futurity. He contrasts, in his usual style of narrow cynicism, the United States with our own Colonies. Because, he says, 'a comparatively old country with 30,000,000 inhabitants, can find one man to go for a fixed period at a good salary to one of the most dignified positions in the world—*ergo*, that a new Colony, with less than a million inhabitants (and no Colony except Canada

has so large a population), can find a number of eligible men to go round the world annually, at their own expense, to a post of (I fear) little dignity, I do not see.'

Is it possible he is unable to open his eyes to the fact that our great Colonies of Australasia, of New Zealand, of South Africa, and of Canada will, one of these days, each have their millions of inhabitants too? I at least can dare to anticipate that period in my contemplation of the future.

The alternative, *then*, will lie between 'Imperial Federation' and 'disintegration.' All the arguments I have brought forward in support of the former are derived from the deepest conviction of the political, economical, and social advantages it will bring to the Colonies, as well as to the mother-country. As one example, take the question of the number of diplomatic and consular representatives, a first-class Power like the United States, has at present in Europe alone. Probably a number nearer to a hundred than fifty individuals are included in this costly though distinguished list. As independent nations, each of our great colonies would eventually require a similar expensive *rôle* to place them *en rapport* with the leading nations of the world. Such a list, which 'Colonus' imagines could never be selected at all, but which I contend, would be created, whenever required, would go far to fill up the ranks of the allotted proportion of representatives from the 'Empire beyond the seas' in an Imperial Parliament.

Once again I must protest most emphatically against the reiterated use of the term '*Federal Council*,' which

'Colonus' will continue to make, and which, he says, 'with a legal, will have no real power.' I insist, on the contrary, as do your correspondents Mr. Fox, and 'A Constant Reader,' also, that it is an 'Imperial Parliament'—not a 'Federal Council,' for which we are contending—and that this Assembly must be invested with supreme 'legal' and 'real power' over all Imperial questions.


I sincerely trust that this great question may be approached and discussed by the thoughtful portion of my fellow-countrymen calmly and dispassionately; and that they may look at it fairly and temperately, and with an earnest desire to discard all prejudice. Its advantages are immense to ourselves and to our posterity. As Britons, with a history of which we may be justly proud, we may reasonably desire to hand it down to those who come after us to cherish it as we do, wherever they may have drawn their breath within the realms of our wide dominion, whether it be in Canada, in Africa, in Australia, or in New Zealand, so that

The flag that's braved a thousand years  
The battle and the breeze


may continue to be the soul-stirring symbol of a glorious nationality, and the proud emblem for all time of the United British Empire.

*May 10.*





## APPENDIX.



### No. I.

*From 'PHILO-COLONUS,' published in 'THE COLONIES'*  
*of January 16, 1873.*

THE great principle of Federation is occupying the earnest attention of many ardent friends of the British Empire, both in England and in the Colonies. It presents a splendid vision to the delighted eye of the imagination, the vision of a combination of States exceeding in magnitude and power any known to the civilised world since the days of the Roman Empire. But then the structure of such a nation would far transcend in true glory and excellence the great State constructed by the Romans. Their power was held together by force. The central authority was a despotism, resting absolutely on military strength. The nations were subject to a might which they could not resist. They had no part in the government of their several societies. A grinding, undeveloping despotism weighed on their minds as well as on their bodies. The result was as certain as it was odious. The people of the world decayed in energy and moral worth, in arts and commerce—in a word, in civilisation. The human race might have sunk to a condition of much lower grade but for the rough and undisciplined, but fresh and vital force of

the wild tribes which encircled the Roman frontier. Quite otherwise would it be with the Federated British Empire. There the principle of cohesion would not be force. The union would be voluntary, and no other foundation for the political combination would be possible but self-government by means of some central institution. Some of the members of the British Empire are already great States; a brief lapse of years will render them and many of their juniors powerful countries. Coherence by compulsion would be altogether out of the question; the colossal edifice would certainly be a mighty voluntary association.

But not only does the moral grandeur of such an Empire attract minds by its appeal to some of the noblest sentiments of human nature; there are other solid and strong reasons, of a more material nature, which suggest such a political institution as an object most important and desirable to cultivate. The relations between Great Britain and the Colonies avowedly need, in the opinion of most persons who are capable of making a forecast of the future, a stronger foundation than they yet possess. They stand at present on the basis of colonial self-government, or a state of practical independence, limited only by belonging to the crown of England, and thereby holding together as a single community. The Colonies pursue their own self-development, as understood by the ideas of each of them separately; they provide for their own particular wants for themselves; and they encounter no interference from the mother-country in their domestic legislation. The great Imperial charges remain attached to the Imperial Parliament. The right of declaring peace and war towards any other power is reserved for the common Sovereign, and as a natural consequence, the obligation to defray the expenses of war is a burden which is imposed exclusively on the maternal shoulders. Now it is easy to perceive that the circumstances under which the Colonies exist necessarily tend to a constant increase of this charge. In proportion as they acquire the size and importance of great States, the expense of military defence, not only when actual warfare breaks out, but also in

the previous and most essential stage of preparation, must keep pace with their growth. Such a burden would speedily become heavier than the shoulders of the heavily-taxed inhabitants of the mother-country could bear; without assistance from the Colonies themselves, England could not suffice, by herself alone, for such a duty. A common understanding with the Colonies thus becomes inevitable, and common deliberation and joint action appear a manifest political necessity. Here a basis is obtained for some kind of national union, closer and more connected together by decisions taken by the collective members in common council. I recognise, therefore, not only the necessity, but also the extreme desirableness and expediency of some form of Federation.

But there is a wide gap, indeed, between such a modified joint action and the splendid idea of one State, one Empire, one mind, and one action, which is the vision of Federalists. With extreme reluctance I feel myself compelled to question the reality of such an idea; I much doubt whether it can ever be brought into the region of the practicable. There is an individuality, a distinct and separate personality in Colonial existences, which seems to be incapable of being solved into true national unity. Such a unity essentially turns on the enforcement of a single national Will; and the probability of the supremacy of such a centre of life fades away, for my eyes at least, into the dimmest haze. We must not think of small societies; much may go on with youthful associations, which, by the law of human nature, would become impossible when they attained manhood. A single legislative assembly for such a multitude of societies is not conceivable as a working instrument of government. These great bodies would be animated with too strong a feeling, I will not say of independence, for that would be to beg the question at issue, but a feeling of what their interests required, of what was due to their respective positions, of unwillingness to accept measures whose evil consequences would fall with special suffering on their particular localities, to be

stable and permanent members of a true single nation. A war compelled by events happening in one part of the Empire, and involving its salvation in that quarter, might bring the severest distress and even ruin on regions situated at the opposite side of the globe. I have no faith in the durability of a public life necessarily implying such a condition. A friendly but earnest desire for separation would inevitably be uttered, and I do not see how it could be resisted. I pass over the interests of small but separate portions of the Empire, whose fate under such a federation would be not to become joint States but only provinces. Let us think of larger elements. Suppose England and Canada voted war with the United States in defence of the latter, and that the interests of Australia and New Zealand were thereby gravely compromised, is it believable that they would continue to sustain the injury and provide their share of the vast expense, whilst it was open to them to say that they thought the time had now arrived for national separation? Or, again, one single State, if governed by a Parliament composed of all its members, would, beyond doubt, abolish protection as a scientific and mischievous folly—would Canada and Australia submit to the general decision? I cannot think it. We have the example of the United States; they have many elements for peculiar success in creating Federation; in truth, they started in the career of union as the confederated assemblage of States. Yet they were compelled to fall back on a central will, asserting itself by force. It is impossible to call the United States a Federal institution. The South asserted its own ideas against the National Congress; it was reduced to submission by war—a war which partook far more of the character of international than of civil war. Equally did the Mormons repudiate the ideas and mode of life of the mass of the States; but force imposed upon them the renunciation of their favourite social principle. In truth, a single State is ever compelled to apply force to its several members. There is not a nation in Europe in which a portion of its inhabitants is not kept in harmony with the

general political and social movements by force. But the application of force is vastly different, when resorted to against groups, so to speak, of individuals, or when directed against social structures, possessing all the elements of independence. A great communist party may be repressed in France: an Australia or Canada resolved to be independent could not be prevented. The fact that the Colonies are separated from the mother-country and each other by vast spaces of sea is decisive as to the possibility of the application of force. The Americans could gather the military strength of vast regions, and march against the dissolving separatists; neither England nor the rest of the Empire could reduce Canada and Australia to dependence, when they had become great peoples.

But I shall be told Federation is demanded solely on the voluntary principle. The several parts of the Empire would submit of themselves to have their wishes overruled, their local interests injured, out of regard for the immense benefit which a united Empire would confer; I wish that I could believe in the permanence of such a feeling. That it exists to-day, and would do for some moderate space of time to come, I fully believe. The strength of England is at the present hour great enough to shelter all the colonies, Canada perhaps excepted, from harm, whilst the practical independence of local legislation, which they enjoy, satisfies their present desires. Federation might, nay, certainly would, cost them Protection; but they would easily reconcile themselves to the loss of a system which enriched individual colonists with wealth extracted from the pockets of the whole colonial community. But a great United Empire—when the Colonies were large States—would infallibly engender a collision of powerful particular interests; and in the absence of a possible and permanent application of force, I cannot but conclude that Federation, however brilliant and humane in conception, however dazzling to the imagination and to many of the noblest aspirations of human nature, would, nevertheless, in its true essence, be absolutely nothing better than a rope of sand.

## No. II.

*From 'H. de B. H.,' in 'THE COLONIES' of  
January 24, 1873.*

MY attention has been drawn to an able and forcible letter which has just appeared in your Journal with the signature 'Philo-Colonus.' While I strongly sympathise with his ample recognition of 'the extreme desirableness and expediency of some form of Federation,' I cannot agree with him in believing Colonial Federation to be a purely Utopian scheme—a scheme presupposing universal enlightenment and a cheerful acquiescence in moral and benevolent forms of suasion. As I interpret the arguments of your correspondent—and these arguments are stated with such luminous precision that I only regret their pessimism—'Philo-Colonus' relies on the discouraging analogy of the Roman Empire, and on the more serious element of doubt suggested by the violent rupture of Federal principles in the United States, and the consequent triumph of a centralised democracy. To the remaining argument as to the weakness of bare political ideas unless stamped into reluctant societies by physical force, I shall have something to say presently. A vast Federation, such as we ardently desire, would be Imperial in its scale and in its noble unity of purpose; it would be at the same time a series of self-governed and self-respecting societies. It would bear no real analogy to the Roman Empire. That magnificent fabric was a centralised despotism, a potent mechanical instrument for diffusing the science and culture of the essentially un-political Greeks. Its moral side was Will, and that Will was imposed upon the world by the sword. This was the old conception of government. An Imperial Federation would embody a new conception, born of ampler ideas and pro-

founder knowledge of human nature and the mysterious powers of race.

The age of beneficent despotisms has gone for ever. To it has succeeded, and is succeeding daily, as a new and terrible force, the force of whole nations and races expressed through their executive governments. If ever the chaos still known as our Colonial Empire be organised into a body politic, with harmonised and vigorous members, it will be by the operation of this new force of ideas energising whole masses of men. This is the secret spring of German strength. A feudal aristocracy, a warm attachment to the past, a severe moral and military discipline—these are only the instruments of German greatness. The German Empire was the outcome of a potent force, it was the victory of race and blood over dynastic traditions, diplomatic checks, and bitter provincialism.

The statesmen of Prussia were well advised. They obeyed and taught others to obey a sovereign and life-giving tendency of this century, and the result was a united Germany, a military power, or rather an armed nation of the highest type and firmest cohesion. May we not also hope, in spite of the severest checks and the most obstinate resistance, for a kindred victory of race over local and geographical difficulties?

‘But,’ replies your correspondent, if I may expand his terse suggestions, ‘granted the grandeur of the Federal idea, are not the United States a monumental instance of its failure in the field of actual politics?’ The objection is serious, but not, I imagine, fatal. The United States, it is true, were furnished, under the care of Washington, with an elaborate paper constitution, reproducing with speculative rigour the more marked characteristics of the British Constitution. So studiously devised were its constitutional checks that, as was proved in the case of Mr. Andrew Johnson, an open breach between the Senate and the President creates as absolute a dead-lock as that ancient and clumsy device the Tribune of the Plebs in Rome. Every State in the Union was to have complete internal self-govern-



ment. Every State was to possess a double electorate—an electorate for the State, and another for Congress. At the beginning of the civil war, the Southern States asserted their sovereign rights, but only to be crushed, and in their fall to bring down with them the principle of Federal liberties. It was the hour of triumph for a centralised democracy. Yet I assert without hesitation that the failure of Federalism in America can be traced to local circumstances, and is in no sense inherent in the system itself. The organic defect in the Federal system of the United States was and is the co-existence of a quasi-sovereign representative body with an autocratic President chosen by an independent vote. It was this defect that was exposed so vividly in the American civil war, but no fair parallel can be made between the rival powers in the constitution of the United States and the relations which would subsist between an Imperial Parliament and the hereditary Crown of the British Empire. Add to this that colonists and Englishmen are for the most part of the same blood, of the same communion, and with common domestic and social traditions, and contrast with this deep-seated sameness the diverse elements of every nationality under heaven, from Chinamen at San Francisco to Germans or Italians in New York, to be found in the United States. This will justify the opinion I boldly express, that Federal principles may be admitted to fail in the United States without damaging our argument in favour of a British Confederation; and, more, before dismissing the United States, I should mention that the existence of a negro population, lately slaves, and now abusing their liberty, and the marked climatic differences between the North and South, are causes which have contributed to an unnatural division among American citizens, but which operate far less in our own colonies.

Finally, I understand 'Philo-Colonus' to despair of any peaceful union between the mother-country, our colonies, and each of them. Force, he says, would have to create such an Empire, and force alone could hold it together. That force

and nothing else will build up Imperial unity I gravely doubt, relying, as I do, upon the operation of great tendencies in peoples and races, and believing that new circumstances will gradually and infallibly shape for themselves new and vigorous types—higher and more complex types—of political fellowship.

The vivid personality of the members of the Empire would not be lost by Federal union, but would remain as a valuable element. As to the assertion that force alone would hold such an Empire together, I freely admit it. This objection is nothing more than a definition of government. An Imperial Government, like all authorities, would use compulsion in the last resort, but that compulsion would not be the oppression of Canada or Australia by England, or of one colony by another: it would be an act of the whole Empire coercing a part for its own benefit and that of the entire body politic. And is this not precisely the end of good government?

---

No. III.

*From 'PHILO-COLONUS,' in 'THE COLONIES' of  
February 15, 1873.*

I HAVE read with great pleasure the reply of 'H. de B. H.' to my letter on Federation. It is most agreeable to me to discuss a question of avowedly great difficulty with a writer distinguished by such remarkable power and range of thought, as well as fairness and moderation, and it is all the more pleasant because the same bright visions kindle the warm aspirations of each of us, the same common desire stirs both our hearts, the same conviction is implanted in both our minds that England

and her Colonies possess the individual elements, the separate members for constructing a single nation, for which the history of the human race offers no parallel. The one question which divides us is the practicability of such a construction. Can the diverse elements, the several faculties and capabilities which actually exist, but all subject to limits which all acknowledge to be but temporary, be combined into a true, compact, abiding, national unity? The formation of a real nation is indisputably a mighty operation. Usually, it is the growth of ages, of the gradual evolution of many forces, which natural qualities of men's minds and the circumstances of human life have set in motion; the question here is whether the political philosophy of our day, acting on materials possessed of great power of expansion, is able by the sheer natural force of reason to frame an organisation which, for size and grandeur, is as yet unknown to history. I am reluctantly compelled by reflection to differ from your correspondent. If, unfortunately, I am correct in my view that the problem is insoluble, I may still be permitted to say of him—

Si Pergama dextrâ  
Defendi possent, etiam hâc defensa fuissent.

Nothing can be truer than his remark that the British Empire 'would bear no real analogy to the Roman.' A centralised despotism, exercised from London on great populations scattered over the surface of the globe, highly organised, and full of strength, is simply inconceivable. I referred to the sway of Rome simply to point out that what was possible in her case is impossible in that of England. The depression, moral and political, of the subject States was the foundation of Imperial Rome: the English Colonies exhibit, and will continue to exhibit, the exactly opposite qualities. Nor would a London despotism be in any way desirable, even if practicable: we may dismiss it then entirely from our thoughts.

Your correspondent refers next to 'a more serious element

of doubt' mentioned by me, 'suggested by the violent rupture of Federal principles in the United States, and the consequent triumph of a centralised democracy.' But when he proceeds to expand my thought as pointing to 'the United States as a monumental instance of the failure of the Federal idea in the field of actual politics,' he has somewhat diverted the exact direction of my meaning. It was not precisely the miscarriage of Federation, nor the establishment of centralised democracy to which I wished to draw attention; the lesson of experience which I sought to impress had a somewhat different character. It was this rather. The United States are a grand group of provinces, of societies, I should rather have said, constituting a single nation, governed by a central Assembly, with a perfect unity of administration. Whether they were combined on the principle of Federation, however that term may be defined, or of a centralised democracy, was irrelevant to the point I wish to enforce. My aim was to show that diversities of political views, and still more of material interests, naturally sprang up in so vast a body, opinions came into collision, they broke out ultimately into civil war, and union had to be restored by force. I argued that such events occurred in all nations, and that in every human society the will of the minority must submit voluntarily to the will of the majority, or else be reduced by force. But the possibility of applying force to great colonies refusing to obey the decision of the central institution, whether Parliament, Federal Assembly, or King, was, according to my view, the exact and decisive difference between the American and British Empires. 'H. de B. H.' has said nothing to shake this belief. I cited questions on which opinions and interests might be most divergent between England and a great colony. I conceive it to be most possible that the colony might prefer independence to submission to the decree of the central organ, and I utterly despair of the power of England or of the Empire to oppose such a determination successfully. Separation by vast spaces of sea, as I said, here counts for everything. In

a continuous land state the inhabitants naturally come to feel themselves to be necessarily one with each other. They circulate freely over the whole territory, as may be seen in the men who flock to California from the eastern seaboard—by the help of railways, the military force has free and rapid access in all directions—the populations get intermixed—a province which accepts a measure exerts a very sensible pressure on an adjoining one that resists—and the maintenance of the national unity is incomparably more easy. But if a powerful Australia, or New Zealand, or South Africa, or Canada, was resolved to separate, does ‘H. de B. H.’ really believe that the means of exercising permanent membership could be found either by England or the Empire? I am absolutely incredulous of the feasibility of such a method of union; nothing but a centralised force like the Roman would be capable of such a feat.

Your correspondent quotes Prussia and Germany: the same reasoning disposes of the idea of analogy here also. The several States of Germany have some divergent interests beyond doubt, but their importance fades into insignificance compared with easily conceivable divergences between England and Australia. Germany has a strong feeling for the precise unity which Federation aims at accomplishing. The English Colonies indisputably desire union; but union may be, nay almost certainly is, something essentially different from unity. Germany is a very small territory compared with the regions comprehended in the British Colonies, and one civil and military administration may be easily made to pervade the whole land. The physical and consequently the political circumstances of the Colonies radically alter the nature of the problem to be solved. ‘Race and blood’ may achieve a lasting ‘victory over dogmatic traditions, diplomatic checks, and bitter provincialism,’ but I find no warrant in this triumph for a similar ‘victory over geographical difficulties,’ for it is precisely geography which, I contend, gives an irresistible power to a dissenting minority, a single colony, as

colonies will be hereafter, to fly away into separation and independence whenever it chooses.

But I must go to the root of the matter, and be allowed to ask what is meant by Federation? What is the precise form of political structure which is designated by this term? Clearly something more is intended than mere political alliance. Nor will the advocates of this system be satisfied, I conceive, to regard the old German Bund, with its seat at Frankfort, as an example of their meaning, for the fellow-members of the Bund might war with one another, and such an organisation would not be a single Federal Empire. The pinch of the matter evidently lies in a centre of government, a determining will, binding on all, an organ, be it King, Parliament, or Grand Council, which lays down peremptory laws for one nation. Thus I understand that the United States are a true Federation; the several members have rights, more or less extended, but Congress, with the aid, if need be, of a vote of universal suffrage, wields supreme legislative power over all these societies. A Federated Empire then means for England and the Colonies a single supreme legislative organ, whose vote is decisive on every department of the life of the nation. That is the theory of the present relation of England to her Colonies. Act of Parliament is still supreme over everything. Though no Englishman would dream of exercising such a power, still those who urge Federation have it at the present hour, but it will not work, and naturally they are not satisfied. They seek an Assembly in which members from every part of the Empire shall sit together, and shall be the government and legislature of the united nation. Now, I ask in all simplicity, is such an institution, in permanent operation, conceivable? Is it supposed to be possible that Colonial votes, or votes gathered from distant regions, shall depose a Prime Minister of England and put another in his place? Can anyone imagine that a majority of such Colonial votes would never be able to impose Protection upon English finance? Would they be suffered to decide

whether the Church of England shall continue to be established or not? Or would the Colonists ever suffer that they should all over the globe be made to pay the same amount of taxes per head as the inhabitants of the old country? If such things should be impossible—and who doubts it?—then plainly Federation becomes only, as now, joint consultation on a few matters only; a true unity, one nation, one people, one Federated society, will not have come into existence.

---

## No. IV.

*From 'H. de B. H.' in 'THE COLONIES,'  
February 21, 1873.*

I MUST thank your correspondent 'Philo-Colonus,' not only for his kind and flattering notice of the few suggestions and arguments which I ventured to put down on paper, in answer to his first letter, but also for the valuable contribution that he has made to the question of Federation. In proposing to consider some of the points made by 'Philo-Colonus' in his second letter, I feel much diffidence, but am not without some sense of encouragement. 'Philo-Colonus,' like a good knight, is at once a courteous and a formidable antagonist, so that it is no slight risk even to break a friendly lance with him. On the other hand, I am glad that 'Philo-Colonus' has scrupulously summed up all possible objections to the practicability of an Imperial Federation. I have read them attentively, and feel positive relief when I think that this is all that the ablest and most skilful of opponents can urge against the possibility of the gradual formation, not indeed of administrative unity in domestic government, but

of Federal union between Great Britain and her Colonies in questions of foreign politics or strictly Imperial interests. Had 'Philo-Colonus' been less of an expert in controversy, I might have feared that he had not said the worst, that he had neglected to probe some weak point in my armour; as it is, I venture to think that we who believe Federalism to be possible as well as beneficial, have excellent defences left, and an impregnable position.

As 'Philo-Colonus' thoroughly agrees with me about the goodness of the Federal idea in itself, I shall consider this as common ground, and address myself to his arguments against the possibility of realising this conception; neither will I dwell upon the fact that the Imperial Federation for which we contend would in no sense resemble a centralised London despotism. I can imagine Paris, Marseilles, and Lyons accomplishing, with M. Gambetta's assistance, what Paris vainly strove to accomplish during the commune of 1871, and actually reducing the unfortunate *ruraux* to complete subjection, but I cannot conceive a democratic London Committee sending peremptory telegrams to Ottawa or Melbourne; still less can I conceive Ottawa or Melbourne as obeying them. 'Philo-Colonus' is here at one with me. He admits that I do not advocate an arbitrary popular government; we both confess that such a system would be impossible. It would be folly to dream of renewing the old colonial policy by which the Colonies were governed as strict dependencies for the benefit of the mother-country, and regarded as primarily sources of revenue. The Roman senators, at the time when the republic had become a senatorial oligarchy, had a pleasant way of talking of subject countries as the farms or rich estates of the sovereign people, worked by them for their own benefit. Such a theory of government is past for ever as regards our Colonies. India, it is true, is still a dependency, but, whether for good or evil, we are daily giving the native population a larger share in administration and local self-government.



'Philo-Colonus' asks me whether I believe that 'the political philosophy of our day, acting on materials possessed of great power of expansion, is able, *by sheer natural force of reason*, to frame an organisation which, for size and grandeur, is as yet unknown to history.' The italics are mine. I answer, No. The question of Colonial Federation is still, I have no hesitation in avowing it, in the stage of speculative politics. I should be very much surprised if it were not. The law of political as of all progress seems to me to be this: first, we hear a few whispers in the cabinet of the student; then the question passes into the area of scientific enquiry; finally, after long maturing, after a severe and searching controversy, it enters the sphere of actual truth and moulds human action. If an Imperial Federation be the best form of political unity for us Englishmen, whether we live in England, in Canada, or in New Zealand, we can well afford to wait patiently and hopefully. This *portus temporis maximus* would take long to form, and endure, when formed, in proportion to the slowness of its growth. From the day in which the Elector of Brandenburg became King of Prussia to the final coalescence of German unity after the late war, far more than a century has passed, but in that slow progress not an hour has been really lost. The despised political theorist generally conquers in the long run; political truths, like religious truths, have no rapid or theatrical victory. All they ask is to be given time, and it is the same with reforms in law or domestic administration. Sir Thomas More criticised the harshness of the English criminal code, which sent poor serving-boys and discharged soldiers to the gallows for theft, yet centuries elapsed before Bentham and Romilly succeeded in humanising our law. Did no one denounce slavery before Clarkson and Wilberforce? Did not Pitt desire Catholic Emancipation a full generation and more before 1829? Moreover, to return to the question of an Imperial union, it is not unlikely that a process of local Federation will precede the larger scheme, especially with the Australian Colonies, and that

these united societies will in their turn enter a true Imperial unity.

Your correspondent comments later on in his letter upon the impossibility of imposing *force* upon an Empire so geographically scattered as our own. Here I fully admit that force must underlie every government and every system of law. Beginning with the policeman or the courts of law, and ending with the refinements of modern gunnery, we find exactly the same state of things: we find a reserve of force. In military matters, it is true, this force is exposed, in civil society it is masked, but it is there all the same. My brilliant antagonist must forgive me for reminding him that none of us who desire Federation contemplate a philanthropic or sentimental union. The Imperial Assembly would be a true legislative body, and not a Court of Arbitration or an Amphictyonic Council. As to the *oceanus dissociabilis*, which 'Philo-Colonus' regards as unfavourably as Horace, I look upon it as a means of union, and I seriously believe that if we governed the British West Indies with a strong hand in the old days, when steam and telegraphs were unknown, and if we governed India fifty years ago under similar conditions, an Imperial authority, composed, it will be remembered, of the actual members of the very Federated societies that it controls, would have no serious difficulty in governing a distant and co-equal branch of the Empire. The mechanical obstacles, small as they are in these days of rapid communication, would be readily counterbalanced by identity in blood and interest, and by the fact that none of the Colonies desire, or are likely to desire, anything but closer intimacy with England. I fear that the spectacle of a Colony all but repudiated by the Home Government is perfectly possible—witness a leader which appeared lately in the columns of a famous journal—but the other picture of a Colony using force to avoid the privileges of political equality and unity I believe happily to be imaginary.

Again, 'Philo-Colonus' asks a most apposite question—

What is meant by Federation? What is its precise form? I perfectly agree with him that it is not represented by such a weak and loose organisation as the old German Bund. We certainly would require—in the exact language of ‘Philo-Colonus’—‘a centre of Government, a determining will, binding on all; an organ, be it King, Parliament, or Grand Council, which lays down peremptory laws for one nation.’ ‘And,’ he adds, ‘you have got such an institution at this moment: you have a Parliament of Imperial powers, though not of Imperial elements, and yet these magnificent pretensions are practically dormant.’ Unhappily it is so; but this I attribute partly to the not unnatural indifference which a gentleman from Cornwall or Yorkshire is likely to feel about some local question in the West Indies or the Mauritius, partly to the lamentable ignorance and confusion of most educated Englishmen on Colonial matters. ‘Philo-Colonus’ has shown us a most excellent reason for thinking that the present so-called Imperial Parliament is not qualified for Imperial administration. The same might be said of the profound apathy displayed in St. Stephen’s during an Indian debate—during a debate about a splendid Empire acquired and retained by Englishmen with romantic courage, or of the carelessness with which most of us regard an Indian appeal to the Privy Council—an appeal affecting enormous interests and involving the most subtle of legal problems. Yet the conclusion I should draw in these cases is the imperfection of the existing body, which claims to deal with Imperial questions, and the crudity of public opinion, both in and out of the House of Commons, on Indian affairs.

This is not the place to discuss details; but I may be allowed to say in passing that I do not believe that the creation of a dozen Colonial Privy Councillors would much mend matters, or the appointment of a Committee of Advice in London. An organic change is necessary, and an Imperial Assembly would have to co-exist with the two Houses of the United Kingdom. They would be to each other as the German Reichstag is to the

Prussian Chambers, each with their clearly-defined province. Such cases as 'Philo-Colonus' contemplates would be impossible. The Canadians or Australians would not be called upon to express an opinion or give a vote upon the appointment of a British Prime Minister, any more than the Colonial Office now interferes with a Victorian Ministry or reads lectures against Protection to Colonies vested with internal self-government. In the same way with the Church, no one would ask Colonial opinion as to the establishment of the Anglican Church in this country, neither am I aware that the Canadians were guided by our judgment at home when they achieved practical independence for the Church in Canada. The Church in Jamaica was silently disestablished a few years ago, while in India, although we give the Anglican Communion a legal superiority, we also subsidise the Roman Catholics and the Presbyterians. I merely give these instances as specimens of the ease with which municipal independence can exist side by side with Imperial unity, which will always be the stronger for leaving local questions alone. Special systems of land tenure, even variations in the law of marriage and succession, together with differences in the status of religious communions, would be perfectly consistent with the *idem velle* and *idem nolle* in matters of Imperial interest, which the ancients believed to be of the essence of political agreement. Questions of peace and war, of international treaties, and national defence, would be fitting subjects for an Imperial Assembly. If the Colonists had a voice in our diplomacy, and in the declaration of war, I know that they would wear the Imperial uniform, and that we would have gallant friends willing to share with us the burdens and the honours of victory in every quarter of the globe.

---

## No. V.

‘F. R. G. S.’ in ‘THE COLONIES,’ *March* 15, 1873.

IN these days of insensate howlings on various subjects, the independence of our Colonies among the number, we think thoughtful men, whether Colonists or Englishmen, will owe you a debt of gratitude for opening your pages to a discussion of the grand idea of Colonial Federation.

No one will deny that Federation, in some form or other, is possible. The new German Empire is a Federation, with an Imperial Legislature legislating for the whole, and Prussian, Saxon, Bavarian, and other Legislatures regulating local matters. A Senate has other duties besides those of a vestry meeting, as has recently been said. It is not necessary for a senate to ‘rejoice the controversy of threepence to a second day of audience.’ The Austrian Empire is a Federation—Francis Joseph, Kaiser in Vienna, is King in Buda-Pesth. The Swiss Republic is a Federation. The United States are a Federation. Finally, the Dominion of Canada is a Federation, and a grand one. The Roman Empire was not a Federation. So long as the *civis Romanus sum* held a mysterious shield over a man, the Empire was mistress of the world, and no longer. Federation is, then, possible, and not chimerical. It implies these things among others:—

1. Free consent of the Federated provinces or States.
2. A central Government to legislate on matters Imperial.
3. The submission of a minority to the will of the majority—forced submission if necessary.

Law has no meaning without force. Government without force is enthroned anarchy, a no-thing needing to be forthwith

swept into the limbo of vanities. One member would join the Federation for its own good, and safety, and protection. The whole Federation would prevent a member leaving because that might injure the good and safety of the whole.

But we think that the course of British Colonial legislation has gradually led up to the idea of a Federated British Empire. In the early days of George III. 'a centralised despotism exercised from London' unlimited control with such results as may be remembered. From 1768 to 1795 Colonial affairs (with some slight exceptions) were administered by Secretaries of State, who managed also the affairs of Ireland and the Home Department. From 1795 to 1852 the Colonial Secretary was also Secretary for War. From 1854 we have had Secretaries of State for the Colonies only, and permanent Under-Secretaries since 1833. India has now its separate Secretary.

Then, again, it has been our policy to confer representative institutions on our Colonies, so soon as their position or their population, or even their desire warranted such a gift or burden. Our Colonies have their Governor and Executive Council, their Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies in exact counterpart of King and Cabinet, Lords and Commons.

Each has thus had an individuality conferred upon it; has administered without let or hindrance, except such as resulted from the 'forms of its House,' its own local affairs; and has looked to the mother-country only for the appointed Governor, for Royal sanction to certain matters, and for questions involving peace and war. It is clear that these Governments may form a Federation which shall be a vast improvement upon the present loose way in which they are held together—supposing them to be held together in a loose way, which we very much doubt.

The idea is not new. It has, if we mistake not, been mooted ere now by some of our Australian Colonies. It has (we speak under correction) been the subject of deputations from the Colonial Legislatures to the Colonial Office, and through it to the British House of Commons. That it should be pooh-poohed

by the Press, and laughed at or talked down by some M.P.'s as the pet idea or annual scheme of a better-informed member, does not prove that it deserves such treatment. All really great schemes have been similarly scouted.

That the affairs of vast Colonies should be legislated on by M.P.'s who know no more about them than a cow does (as a dweller in Australia for twenty years said once in our hearing, with more pith than politeness), is, of course, absurd. If, then, the notion of a Federated British Empire be possible, as we distinctly believe it to be, the vastness of the question and the interests at stake should not deter us from attempting to bring it about. But, further, even if the notion be chimerical, as it is manifestly intended for the safety and increased prosperity of the whole; as it is urged in the interests of advancing civilisation and the progress of the species, which we are all bound to further, though we see not with Comtists our immortality therein; as it is a voluntary union for a noble purpose, we shall still be doing good by advocating it.

Meanwhile, something of the following kind is possible at once without putting more machinery in motion than we have. Let each Colony elect one or more members, in proportion to its size, to form a Colonial Council under the presidency of Earl Kimberley. Let questions of purely Colonial policy be discussed. The establishment of the English Church, which has been referred to as showing the impracticability of Federation, is not a question for the Federal Parliament at all, but for the English people, and therefore cannot come into the question.

But since the Colonies are ours, and, like Shylock's pound of flesh, some of them have been dearly bought, they are ours by 'cannon law,' and we mean to keep them. 'Colonies are not to be picked up in the street every day,' and we venture with your permission to let Carlyle speak a little more at length:—

'As for the Colonies, we purpose through Heaven's blessing to retain them a while yet! Shame on us for unworthy sons of brave fathers if we do not. Brave fathers, by valiant blood and

sweat, purchased for us, from the bounty of heaven, rich possessions in all zones; and we, wretched imbeciles, cannot do the function of administering them! And because the accounts do not stand well in the ledger, our remedy is, not to take shame to ourselves, and repent in sackcloth and ashes, and amend our beggarly imbecilities and insincerities in that as in other departments of our business, but to fling the business overboard, and declare the business itself to be bad? We are a hopeful set of heirs to a big fortune! It does not suit our Manton gunneries, grouse-shootings, mousings in the City; and like spirited young gentlemen we will give it up, and let the attorneys take it? \* \* \* \* They are portions of the general earth, where the children of Britain now dwell; where the gods have so far sanctioned their endeavour, as to say that they have a right to dwell. England will not readily admit that her own children are worth nothing but to be flung out of doors! England, looking on her Colonies, can say: "Here are lands and seas, spice-lands, corn-lands, timber-lands, overarched by zodiacs and stars, clasped by many-sounding seas; wide spaces of the Maker's building, fit for the cradle yet of mighty Nations and their Sciences and Heroisms. Fertile continents still inhabited by wild beasts are mine, into which all the distressed population of Europe might pour themselves, and make at once an Old World and a New World human. By the eternal fiat of the gods, this must yet one day be; this by all the Divine Silences that rule this Universe, silent to fools, eloquent and awful to the hearts of the wise, is incessantly at this moment, and at all moments, commanded to begin to be. Unspeakable deliverance, and new destiny of thousandfold expanded manfulness for all men, dawns out of the Future here. To me has fallen the godlike task of initiating all that: of me and of my Colonies, the abstruse future asks, Are you wise enough for so sublime a destiny? Are you too foolish?"'

But Federation, desirable or not, is not an immediate want. We can afford to wait and live up to it, and into it. Our



Colonies had representative institutions forced upon them in some cases, at any rate, as 'N.'s' letter in your No. 128 shows. Let us not be hasty to force Federation on them while they are happy under our rule, much as that needs improving. One of your correspondents thinks it not possible for the Central Government to enforce its will on a dissentient member. Perhaps this would be impossible for the 'Power of England,' though that once withstood the world in arms, but not for that of the Federated Empire. It strikes us that the letter of Mr. G. R. Kingsmill, a Canadian, quoted in No. 128, answers this objection. 'We should,' he says, 'be untrue to our British blood if we were to whimper like children and threaten annexation whenever any point of Imperial policy was not just in accord with our wishes and views.' This is before Federation. This is while Canada is fresh from San Juan boundary, Fishery Rights, and other adverse decisions.

The natives of Canada boast themselves as loyal as any who glory in the Union Jack. The 'geographical difficulties' referred to by one of your correspondents hardly apply to Ireland, or to Hyde Park disturbers, and yet they are not noted for loyalty. Moreover, the 'wire,' steamships, ironclads, and sixty-four ton guns, are minimising this difficulty, if it exist at all.

To belong to a great Empire, which can protect, and does, is far better than forming a series of pettifogging States, the prey of each other, and of the nearest most powerful territory-coveting neighbour. All natural-born subjects of her Majesty, in that grand Empire on which the sun never sets, have their material rights attended to by British ambassadors and consuls in every court and civilised port in the world. For economical reasons these States should not be multiplied. Division of labour had better not go on in governing, or at any rate in establishing new governments.

But it may be urged that this is beside the mark. We think, with submission, not. We urge it to show that Federa-

tion, not being immediately needed, had better not hastily be concluded chimerical, still less impossible.

A Federated Parliament of two Houses, not too numerous, sitting in London and legislating for the whole British Empire, on purely Imperial matters, leaving local matters to the English and other Houses of Commons, would go far to realise Tennyson's notion in 'Locksley Hall':—

Till the war-drum throb'd no longer and the battle flags were furl'd,  
 IN THE PARLIAMENT OF MAN, THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD.  
 There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,  
 And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in UNIVERSAL LAW.

The poet, *the* maker, has before now been in advance of the politician, and may be again.

P.S.—Small causes are many times productive of huge effects. Napoleon was accustomed to say the word 'Pretender' lost the Stuarts the throne. It would thus appear that the English warred once at any rate for an 'idea,' or against one. Still as a rule, the English pay small respect to mere feeling as such. A friend of ours, with much experience in colonial life, urges the following as a reason for Federation:—'It would give able and ambitious men in the Colonies a better and wider position than they now hold. Thus if an American come to England he goes here and there; has his ambassador to introduce him, and so forth. But if a leading man from the Colonies come—a man occupying a position similar, or, perhaps, superior to that of our American cousin—he is just nobody, and his field of political or other action is so much narrower than that of a citizen of the U.S.A.' We hardly agree with the 'just nobody,' but there is much and weighty truth in the statement.

---

## No. VI.

LEADER *from* 'THE COLONIES,' *April 1, 1873.*

FEDERATION! What an impracticable idea, the bright, romantic dream of enthusiasts, not to be thought of by statesmen! England does not want it, the Colonies don't ask for it. There is no Colonial or Imperial question. The relations of mother-country and Colonies are admirable. Time enough to think of the future; to make any plans, to discuss any policy for the Empire, is not for sensible, practical men, but only for theorists, speculators, and grievance-mongers. Some such impetuous torrent of thoughtlessness is sure to be directed upon the devoted head of any far-sighted man who ventures to suggest that in a few years, when the Colonies are more full grown, their relations with England will require considerable alteration, and are even now susceptible of some improvement, and that it is prudent to consider in time upon what permanent footing the Empire must exist. It is astonishing that men of forethought, who speak sensibly upon other political problems, should be found re-echoing feeble, unintelligent objections to the timely consideration of a great Imperial policy for the future. Those who think little upon this great question understand less the process through which it, in common with other great policies, is passing, or they would not condemn or despise the early stages of its discussion. To such short-sighted superficial observers, the wise words of our correspondent 'H. de B. H.' convey rebuke as well as instruction—'The law of political as of all progress seems to us to be this: first, we hear a few whispers in the cabinet of the student; then the question passes into the area of scientific enquiry; finally, after long

maturing, after a severe and searching controversy, it enters the sphere of actual truth and moulds human action.

There are times and places for everything; and, although we are of opinion that the discussion of the Imperial question should never be allowed to drop throughout the Empire, the time has not arrived to bring it forward by direct motions in the House of Commons. That august assembly is peculiarly sensitive about being treated as a mere debating society, or Social Science Association for the consideration of questions before they are ripe for legislation, and therefore such annual 'exercitations' as those of the well-meaning and amiable member for Leith seriously damage the cause they are intended to serve. The advocates of Federation have abundant opportunities of recommending their policy to Parliament without resorting to direct resolutions. At least half-a-dozen questions arise every Session, from which a moral may easily be drawn in favour of the policy. For instance, no better opportunity for its discussion could be afforded than such a motion as that of Lord Eustace Cecil about the Colonies contributing to the defences of the Empire. Then again the Treaty of Washington and the awards arising out of it, involved many considerations, which a skilful advocate of Federation in the House of Commons might have turned to good account.

We regret, before considering the able and lucid treatment of Federation by our correspondents 'Philo-Colonus' and 'H. de B. H.' to be obliged to speak in different terms of another discussion of Imperial policy. We must object to the name of Federation being given to any such plan as that of Mr. Macfie. Such a council as he proposes would not be entitled to it. It would have no power to legislate or to tax. Sir Charles Adderley truly described it to be as impracticable as the restoration of the Heptarchy; and it is certainly injurious to the cause of real Federation to have its good name assigned to projects which bear to it only the faintest resemblance, if any whatever.

The want of information displayed in the debate was surprising. Even the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, who it would have been expected should have been pretty well acquainted with different views of Imperial policy, assumed that Mr. Macfie's plan and the suggestion that the Colonies should send a few members to the House of Commons, were the only modes of Federation which had ever been suggested; whereas such complete practical working systems as those of Germany, Switzerland, and the United States advocated at the Colonial Conference the summer before last, and at the Social Science Congress last autumn, and which have been far more fully discussed than either of the other proposals, were never once referred to in the course of the debate. Surely stronger proof of the necessity of fuller and more frequent consideration and discussion of the Imperial question could not have been furnished.

A fallacy, conspicuous among many in the debate, was that—oft-repeated when the improvement of Imperial relations is suggested—the Colonies have no 'grievances,' therefore, why consider changes in their relations to England. Now the whole argument of those who counsel timely consideration of the best means of holding the Empire together in the future is based upon the absence, rather than the existence, of grievances. The Federalist declares they are so few, so easily removable—that the elements of unity produced by common interests, relationship and affection exist in such force among the people of the Empire—that closer political ties should flow as the logical consequence of such a happy state of things, and that a period of profound calm, when there are no irritating questions, is the best to discuss, to lay deep the foundations of the future political organisation of the Empire. Because we may desire to improve our fortunate condition—to add to our security and influence, by utilising and consolidating the strength of the Empire, by organising a Central Government, which alone can weld together and wield its vast, disconnected power—is it to

be implied that we are discontented, or believe in the existence of grievances ?

From the misconceptions which so largely prevail respecting Federation, it is a positive relief to turn to clear views and language. 'Philo-Colonus' and 'H. de B. H.' have put the two sides of the question so well before our readers, that we feel we need not say much upon the subject. We think that a fair judgment of this controversy must decide that 'Philo-Colonus' has said the very worst that can be said of Federation ; and the friends of that policy will, with 'H. de B. H.,' feel relief that so little can be urged against it. Both gentlemen about equally admire the grand idea, and differ only as to its being practicable. The former evidently regards it as too good to be true ; he abandons the object of his admiration with the regret of a lover, the warmth of whose attachment has filled him with such a dread of refusal that he cannot bring himself to press his suit. This is the explanation of the despair of Federation by one who speaks of it as 'a splendid vision to the delighted eye of the imagination ;' who 'with extreme reluctance' feels 'compelled to question the reality of such an idea ;' who says 'the same bright vision kindles the warm aspirations of each of us, the same common desire stirs both our hearts, the same conviction is implanted in both our minds, that England and the Colonies possess the individual elements, the separate members for constructing a single nation, for which the history of the human race offers no parallel.' 'Philo-Colonus' has evidently thought so anxiously over the question that he has conjured up fears which have no real existence ; his imagination has conceived such an appalling theory about Force, as to dispel all his hopes of securing that Federation which he so much admires ; and his misconception of the scope of the Federal authority leads him to regard Force as an important element in the consideration of the question.

'H. de B. H.' more accurately weighs the importance of Force. He shows that with many powerful ties which would

connect the Federated Empire, it would mean nothing more nor less than 'good government.' What 'Philo-Colonus' says of Force is as true of smaller States as it would be of our Empire; it is as true of Spain, France, or even England. Will Force be sufficient to keep Spain united under a single Government, should the provinces declare for a Federal Republic? Would it avail in France if the nation were favourable to the country being split into several governments? Would it in the United Kingdom if the people willed to be separated from each other; nay, if those of the divisions of England which formerly composed the Heptarchy were firmly resolved to restore it, would Force avail to preserve the unity of England?

Force, then, would be needed and would be unavailing to preserve the unity of these compact States, as it would that of our world-wide Empire, were it, and not the free-will of the inhabitants, the bond of unity in the one instance as in the other. But, says 'Philo-Colonus,' 'separation by vast spaces of sea here counts for everything.' Undoubtedly, if all the sections of the Empire wished to break asunder from each other. But take for example the most distant section of the proposed Federation. Australia would not be separated from the Empire, she would be part of it as much as Ireland is part of the United Kingdom, and the will of the Australian people in accordance with that of the rest of the Empire would be too strong for a disaffected minority, or at the worst would, with the aid of Federal force, be sufficient to restrain it. Our unity being of free-will, not of force, distance would not affect it. Against this assertion of 'Philo-Colonus' may be set off that of another distinguished Anti-Federalist, Professor Thorold Rogers, who says—'There is no difficulty in carrying out the project because the Colony is distant from the seat of Government.'

But, argues 'Philo-Colonus'—and herein lies the strength, or rather the weakness of his case—Force would be indispensable, because 'a great United Empire would infallibly engender a collision of powerful particular interests.' Our correspondent

would be right were his conception of the nature of the Federal Constitution required not so entirely wrong – were it necessary that there should be ‘a single supreme legislative organ, whose vote is decisive on every department of the life of the nation ;’ were it to attempt ‘to impose protection upon English finance,’ or free-trade upon some of the Colonies, or ‘to decide whether the Church of England shall continue established or not,’ or to make the Colonies ‘pay the same amount of taxes per head as the inhabitants of this country.’ Were Federation thus to meddle and muddle with every question of provincial policy, the will of the whole Empire would rise up against such an intolerable system, and all the force in the world would be unable to preserve it.

‘H. de B. H.,’ more clearly perceiving what would be the proper functions of the Federal Government, completely answers ‘Philo-Colonus,’ by showing that such collision of interests as he dreads would be impossible, because the questions out of which it could arise would most fitly be left to the provincial Governments; and he lays down the true principle that ‘Imperial unity will always be the stronger for leaving local questions alone.’ Nor is it difficult to distinguish Imperial from local questions. The Federal Constitution of the Canadian Dominion has successfully defined the limits of the Federal and of the provincial Governments, and it would be still more easy to do so in an Imperial Constitution uniting dominions separated ‘by vast spaces of sea.’ ‘H. de B. H.’ not only answers ‘Philo-Colonus’s’ question—‘what is meant by Federation?’ by showing it would not be embarrassed with the numerous and irritating questions his opponent imagines, but goes on to point out that it must be something more real than a mere Council of Advice, or body of Colonial Privy Councillors, or any of those fanciful chimerical contrivances, which, if to be thought of at all, could only be considered as mere stopgaps for something better. He says ‘an Imperial Assembly would have to co-exist with the two Houses of the United Kingdom.’ While advocates of Im-



perial unity who reject Federation cannot see their way before them, and have no policy, Federalists are agreed both as to questions which are Imperial, and to the nature of the Federal Government; and this is because they are not mere theorists, but practical men, who, seeing a system working well in various countries, think it is worth trying whether it may not prove vastly more successful still—whether by means of it our Empire may not become the greatest power of the future. It is not surprising, therefore, that ‘H. de B. H.,’ the Colonist of twenty years’ standing, who wrote from Melbourne ‘Empire or No Empire,’ in ‘Fraser’s Magazine’ for December, Mr. Jenkins, and Mr. Labilliere, in discussing the question at the Conference on Colonial Questions and at the Social Science Congress, should have come to the same conclusion as to a regular Federal Parliament being required to deal with Imperial questions.

Two other arguments against Federation must also be noticed; one, the breakdown of the system in America, upon which we think even ‘H. de B. H.’ unnecessarily dwells; having disposed of it in a single sentence—‘the failure of Federalism in America can be traced to local circumstances, and is in no sense inherent in the system itself.’ Slavery, with all the hatreds and passions which directly and indirectly arose out of it, was enough to have caused the disruption of the most compact state—of England herself. The sword—Force—alone could settle such an exceptional difficulty. The other argument of ‘Philo-Colonus’ which we must notice is, that a war desired by some sections of the Federation, but which would compromise the interests of others, would assuredly cause disruption. Our correspondent’s view is contrary to all Colonial experience. Feeling in the Colonies has always run high on the side of England in all past wars. The author of ‘Empire or no Empire’ writes from Victoria the following opinion:—‘Whenever the honour of the Empire was attacked in any part of the world, I am sure that there would be no men more anxious to vindicate it at any risk than the representatives of the Colonies.’

We think the fears and difficulties of 'Philo-Colonus' have been well answered, and hope that he will yet enjoy the 'splendid vision,' with the additional gratification of feeling that it may become real. At all events we commend to him the sensible observation of another correspondent, 'F. R. G. S.,' that 'we shall be doing good by advocating' a policy so noble, generous, benevolent, and enlightened, even if we fall short of attaining what we exactly desire. Let us believe Federal unity possible as long as there is hope of it. Let us not in the infancy of the discussion make up our minds against it. It is worth trying hard to accomplish such a noble object. Admiration of a thing so worthy is a great stimulus to efforts which may be sufficient to achieve success. Now that the question of Imperial Federation is only just launched for discussion, let such able men as 'Philo-Colonus,' who admire the grand idea—who are no mere cold-blooded critics—apply their advocacy to remove rather than raise up difficulties to the consolidation of the greatest United Empire it is possible for the world ever to behold.

---

## No. VII.

## A 'COLONY AND PARLIAMENT.'

*From 'THE COLONIES,' June 26, 1874.*

**D**R. HEARN, on March 19, made a speech at the Melbourne Athenæum, to the electors of East Melbourne, so exceedingly remarkable and interesting that we conceive we are only performing an act of just recognition of a great performance when

we endeavour to make it known in England. It is distinguished by statesmanship of the highest order; the treatment of the great subjects he discusses is marked by a breadth of view, accuracy of knowledge, and soundness of judgment which at once reveal a man of great powers of thinking and speaking. It is our deliberate opinion that there are few men in the English House of Commons who are capable of handling a political question of first-rate importance with so much intellectual superiority and perfect mastery of the subject as Dr. Hearn displayed before his audience at Melbourne. Victoria may be most legitimately congratulated on the possession of so eminent a statesman and orator.

The theme was a lofty one. The British Empire, the real nature of a Colony, its true relation to the Mother Country, and the fitting structure of its Parliament, were the texts on which Dr. Hearn discoursed. He could not have found any which called more peremptorily for high intelligence and educated reason; and he was equal to the occasion. Two words present themselves to him for definition; but they are words of extreme significance—a Colony and Parliament. ‘The word colony reminds us,’ commences Dr. Hearn, ‘that we are not alone in the world; we form part of a great and ancient monarchy.’ A noble feeling, and nobly expressed. The monarchy of Queen Victoria is felt not to belong more to Englishmen than to the colonists of Melbourne. There is no breach, no yawning gap in the Imperial State; it is one continuous expanse of a single nation. The simplicity as well as the strength of the remark shows that it was not an intellectual proposition which was laid down, but a moral element implanted in the speaker’s being. ‘There are some persons,’ continues Dr. Hearn, ‘in whose ear the word colony sounds harsh; it seems to imply a certain amount of abasement, a relation which from the nature of things must sooner or later come to an end.’ He repels the thought; he has ‘no sense of humiliation, nor is there any reason to suppose that at any time, however distant, we shall be se-

## A COLONY AND PARLIAMENT.

parated from our Mother Country.' We have only to set before our minds the fact that this was an address spoken to the electors by a man who was a candidate for a seat in Parliament, and we shall know what to think of those who describe the minds of the colonists as being set on separation. Then comes a view which marks the statesman. The colonies are integral parts of one common nation; but they are characterised by one peculiarity. They are fellow-subjects of the same Queen, but they possess 'the inestimable benefits of self-government.' 'The Queen's enemies are the enemies of Australians, her friends theirs'; the very point we have so often pressed, that the colonists are protected by the developed strength of their older fellow-subjects. He knew the value of this advantage. But, along with this feeling, Dr. Hearn desires an Australian nationality, but a nationality that seeks for no other flag than the Imperial flag, the brave old Union Jack of England. Such expressions are something far stronger and more real than mere well-worded statements; nothing reveals the inward emotions so powerfully as symbols.

Dr. Hearn next passes to the region of practical politics, to the domain of rule and government. 'We make our own laws by our own Parliament.' This said, we were startled by the inference which was instantly drawn. 'If we make our own laws, it is our duty to obey them.' But what could be the motive for preaching this deduction so markedly? 'Public men have obtained credit by endeavouring to set aside the laws they were placed in office to administer.' Victoria is visited with the same social malady as England; we almost fancied that we were listening to a speech from the Archbishop of Canterbury. Disloyalty to the law in its own officers has crossed the ocean; the two hemispheres are suffering from the same disease. The field in which the disorder has broken out is not the same in both countries; disrespect for law in Victoria manifests itself in the department of land; in England it is the administration of the Church which prompts a new law to enforce obedience to

the established Constitution. Dr. Hearn and Archbishop Tait are uttering the same language, and indicating the same principles: change the law if it is an injudicious one, but obey it whilst it is the law; most of all, if you are an officer charged with the duty of administering it. The coincidence is truly striking; human nature evidently knows no differences of latitude and longitude. Lastly, Dr. Hearn takes up the great question which now agitates the new Colony of Victoria, as it does other nations of more ancient origin—what ought to be ‘the structure of Parliament’? To us it is eminently gratifying to find so able a man taking his stand on the principle we have so often asserted in this journal; ‘two Houses of Legislature, and those Houses mutually independent, are absolutely essential to the liberties of the people.’ This is the true doctrine; the co-existence and co-equality of two Houses are demanded by no narrower an interest than the liberty of the whole community. Nothing less is at stake; without ‘this guarantee’ the liberties of the people, their self-government, and supremacy over their own Parliament cannot be maintained. ‘Abuse of power’ is inevitable with a single Assembly; undivided power is as fatal to freedom in a single Chamber as in a despot. The continued harmony of two such bodies is, no doubt, difficult to secure; but, as Dr. Hearn points out, example shows that the task, though occasionally arduous, may nevertheless be accomplished. In America thirty or forty States possess Legislatures composed of two Houses, yet no quarrel has ever been seen amongst them. And what is the force which has achieved this noble result in England equally as in America? The common-sense of Englishmen, the spirit of compromise which that common-sense has engendered, the absence of which to this very day renders government in France almost impossible, except under the power of military despotism. A sounder conception of the nature of this great practical problem can nowhere be found.

It was the proposition of the Victoria Government, which in substance would suppress the Upper Chamber, that had

called forth these remarks, and Dr. Hearn attacks it with vigour and success. He begins, however, with an admission which we had made ourselves in this journal on a former occasion. The composition of the two Houses ought to be different, but one essential principle is common to them both: both of them should represent, not a class, but the whole people. The interest of both should be identical with the interest of the whole community. There is reason to believe that some well-founded objections may be taken to the present constitution of the Council, and if that is so, those who desire the maintenance of a second House ought to be the first to apply a fitting reform. But the proposal of the Government, that when a Bill had been rejected twice, the two Houses should meet in a single Assembly, and that the majority of the combined Houses should prevail, would be, not reform, but destruction; the special action of the Upper House would disappear, it would simply be swamped. Bravely does Dr. Hearn tell the electors that he prefers the Constitution to the existence of the Ministry. Nor does the history of the course of legislation in Victoria warrant so revolutionary a measure. In eighteen years of responsible government four hundred and eighty Bills have been passed, giving an average of something like twenty-eight a year. The form of the institution clearly is not antagonistic, as such evidence shows, to providing for the wants of the people. Only eleven questions were unadjusted between the two Houses. On one the Upper House was generally held to be wrong, the Miners', or Private Property, Bill. Miners were barred from working on private land of freeholders; the miners declared that the right of mining had been reserved by the State when the freehold was granted. The question was full of difficulty, still public opinion, for the most part, took side with the miners, and imputed the rejection of the Bill to the interest of the freeholders in the Council. But even admitting this to be so, well may Dr. Hearn ask, 'How many Bills have been rejected in England by the House of Lords, not twice, but

twenty times?' The opinion of the English people has steadily declined to regard the rejection of a measure twice as a justification for the overthrow of the British Constitution. No doubt, a deadlock is always possible in the joint action of two independent bodies; and constitutional government must be impossible if no means of extrication could be devised. But such means do exist: that reasonable moderation, that spirit of compromise, that good sense which are never wanting in nations that understand the meaning of their institutions. We know in this country that the House of Lords never forcibly and invincibly arrays itself against the acknowledged will of the country; and Dr. Hearn is able to make the same claim of reasonableness for the Legislative Council of Victoria. 'There never was a single case in which, after a dissolution, when the public opinion was distinctly expressed, the Council refused to pass an Act upon which such an opinion was so expressed.' This is absolutely decisive. The one condition of constitutional government has been strictly observed in Victoria; consequently, the Bill of the Ministry of Victoria has for its object not the removal of a stoppage in legislation caused by the misconduct of the Upper House, but simply revolution—the uncontrolled and unbalanced supremacy of the democracy. Dr. Hearn's statement shows this to be a wanton and unprovoked act, meriting the condemnation of every man who is the friend and supporter of liberty. We congratulate the Colony on the possession of so able, enlightened, and far-seeing a statesman as Dr. Hearn.

---

## No. VIII.

*From* SIR JULIUS VOGEL. (*See the 'STANDARD,'*  
*October 10, 1874.*)

Extract from a Memorandum addressed to Sir James Fergusson, the Governor of New Zealand, by Sir Julius Vogel, proposing a scheme, by which that Colony would be able in future to control the destinies of Polynesia, with the ultimate object of establishing the South Sea Islands as one dominion, with New Zealand as a centre of Government:—

‘I hope that the British possessions will in time be consolidated into a mighty Dominion, and the British Colonies become, not dependencies, but integral and inseparable parts of an Empire owning a naval force so irresistible as to practically afford to its outlying portions full and ample security from the effects of any wars of other nations.’

---

No. IX.

## EMPIRE OR NO EMPIRE.

*A Review from 'THE COLONIES,' January 16, 1873.*

‘EMPIRE or no Empire?’ By a Colonist, who appends the initials W. J. S. and ‘Melbourne, August, 1872,’ to his article, and states that he has lived the last twenty years in



Victoria, appears in 'Fraser's Magazine' for December. The paper is written with great power, and although we cannot exactly concur with all its minor conclusions, or attach the same importance as the author does to some incidental points, we must warmly applaud its advocacy of a policy, to which we have from time to time given expression. That colonists in England who have recently written and spoken on the Imperial question have accurately expressed feelings entertained in the Colonies, is evident from this article which, from first to last, declares with no uncertain sound in favour of federation—the only intelligible policy with respect to the future unity of our Empire which has as yet been suggested either in England or the Colonies. We can only quote a few of the most powerful passages from the article, and strongly advise our readers to get it and read every line of it. It opens with a noble declaration in favour of Imperial sympathies—'we must learn to take an equal interest in all our fellow-subjects, no matter whether they dwell on the banks of the Thames or the Hoogly, the St. Lawrence or the Yarra Yarra. We must be ready to resent an insult to the national flag whenever it is offered. We must admit no prior claim to our regard, on the part of Englishmen, Irishmen, or Scotchmen, Canadians or Australians, Cape Colonists, or East or West Indians; we should only recognise such distinctions, when we think that they are each working in different parts of the world, to extend the borders of the British power, and the lustre of the British Crown.' How to produce this healthy feeling the author wisely points out—'the only way to arouse the people generally from their petty dreams—to disabuse the minds of those who fondly

take the rustic murmur of their bourg,  
For the great wind that echoes round the world;

to strike off the bonds which fetter the imagination of the masses, and confine their minds to the contemplation of their immediate surroundings, and to call the attention of the entire

British people to the great future, which awaits them if their statesmen have only the wisdom and the courage to grasp it—is to admit the representatives of every section of the Empire to a share in the Imperial Councils.’ To the argument against giving the Colonies a voice in Imperial affairs, that they would always oppose war, this Colonist replies—‘I am firmly convinced that a more fallacious idea never gained currency. Whenever the honour of the Empire was attacked in any part of the world, I am sure that there would be no men more anxious to vindicate it, at any risk, than the representatives of the Colonies. As a rule, colonists err on the side of undue pugnacity. They are no admirers of the peace-at-any-price policy, which nowadays appears to be looked on in England as the end of statesmanship.’

The writer then goes on to say that even if it were true that the colonies are a source of military weakness, we should set to ‘work without delay to convert that weakness into strength,’ and then shows that ‘it is time the important internal affairs of Great Britain and Ireland commanded the entire attention of a local executive and a local legislature,’ and that ‘the business of the British Empire has got beyond the power of any one body.’ ‘Against such pusillanimous conduct,’ as he charges Mr. Gladstone’s Government with, he believes ‘the establishment of an Imperial Legislature with an Imperial Executive depending on it, would be no mean safeguard. He also declares that colonists ‘are as jealous of the national name and flag as any dweller on the banks of the Thames,’ and that ‘they have proved their sympathies with the mother-country when she had been in difficulties over and over again; and if they have not done more, may it not arise from the fact that they have never been asked?’ On the subject of defence, it is observed, that ‘there is no reason to doubt, that if the work of consolidating the Empire were set about in an energetic and prudent manner, the Colonies would be found willing to contribute their fair share to the maintenance of the Imperial forces.’ . . . ‘As long

as England is paramount at sea, the Colonies could not do better with any money they may have to spend on external defences (taking for a moment the purely utilitarian view), than invest it in the British navy, provided they had the assurance which representation would give, that it would be used when needed with vigour and promptitude.' The article then at some length rather severely criticises the treatment of Canada in connection with the Alabama question. It is remarked that 'the present Colonial system of Great Britain has a direct tendency to foster the feeling of separate nationality among the various provinces under her dominion,' and that 'Her Majesty's present advisers' are 'utterly without anything like a definite Colonial policy.' It is also shown that—'For want of some body, whose delegates from the extremities and centre alike might meet and confer together on what is best adapted to secure the true interests of the whole . . . the public men of the various Colonies are left to follow any course which may seem good in their own eyes or likely to secure them a lengthened term of office, without any consideration as to what may be the effect of their schemes on the welfare of their neighbours, or how far compatible with Imperial unity. There is another strong reason why something should be done towards federation as speedily as possible, and that is that the majority of the adult population of most of the great Australian Colonies were born in the old country, and consequently better understand the advantages which attend a union with England.' The writer also condemns mere 'warmth and heartiness of expression' on the part of the Colonial Office without any policy being adopted to cement the union with the Colonies—'I am sure,' says he, 'that if we could once arouse the mass of the people of England to a lively sense of what was going on, the Government would be speedily forced to do something to avert the threatened disruption instead of standing by in irritating inactivity, distilling honeyed words from mocking lips.' Speaking of the preference which English

statesmen have for the Foreign Office rather than the Colonial the author remarks—‘But if a minister would only apply himself to the work of consolidating the Empire on a wise and equitable basis, he would find a task ready to his hand far more interesting in its development, and far more glorious in its results, than that of meddling with Princelets, or preserving his temper while being snubbed by those arrogant Powers that cannot be made to see the beauties of a peace at-any-price policy, and daily blaspheme the “shoddy” gods that our countrymen so eagerly worship.’ The author looks to ‘the new element introduced into the political life of England’ by the last Reform Bill, ‘to force on our rulers that task of consolidation which they have hitherto done their utmost to avoid.’ The question—‘How is it that you, and those who think with you on this point, are so anxious for a closer alliance with a Government, of whose recent policy you speak with contempt, and of whose future career you have little hope?’ is thus answered: ‘We look to the revival of national life and energy which would follow the consolidation of the Empire, to renew the face of all things, to bring again the days when statesmen were fearless, and the people honest and true; and when it would have been a foul libel on the national character to affirm that—

Only the ledger lives, and only not all men lie.’

This powerful article thus concludes:—‘Our venerable mother would renew her youth, and, as an acknowledged head of a Greater Britain, would occupy her legitimate place at the head of the family of nations.

‘The Colonies, having passed their apprenticeship, and become partners in the great firm, would find in connection with it an outlet for their restless energies, and the wherewithal to satisfy a praiseworthy ambition to achieve a distinction on a larger stage than that at the command of any dependent State.

‘The change wrought in the character of the Imperial Government by the consummation of this union would, I believe, be as satisfactory as it would be complete. In Council, the experience of age and the vigour of youth would act and react on each other, and we might reasonably hope that from the conflict of opinions so influenced, a policy would be evolved which any subject of the Queen might regard with satisfaction, and speak of without a blush—a policy which would hit the happy mean between bluster and severity—between Quixotism on the one hand, and sordid self-seeking on the other.

‘Although the prospect of achieving this great work of confederation does not seem very encouraging at present, I nevertheless look forward to the time when this day-dream of so many will resolve itself into a substantial reality. Of our present rulers I have but little hope, but I cannot bring myself to think that the nation at large will remain much longer indifferent to the glorious future which might be the heritage of our race, if we only had the energy “to take occasion by the hand,” instead of wasting our mighty opportunities through ignorance or sloth. A consolidated British Empire is still possible, but will not be possible much longer.’

We leave these extracts to speak with their own force; and shall only remark that we hope the assertion that Confederation is only the dream of a few Colonists and speculators in England will not be again repeated, and that we are proud to find that there are in the Colonies men of large statesmanlike views, who are able to soar above mere provincial questions, from which the fame of Colonial statesmen and of English statesmen as well is almost exclusively derived.

---

## No. X.

## THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

*Leader from 'THE COLONIES,' November 27, 1875.*

**M**R. FORSTER'S speech at Edinburgh constitutes an era in the history of the British Empire. If proof were desired of the truth of this statement we have but to turn to the anger which that powerful oration kindled in the bosom of the 'Times.' The great journal was startled by the rude shock which Mr. Forster gave to its ideas on the relations of England to her Colonies. The criticisms which it poured forth so lavishly and so warmly on the various positions taken up by Mr. Forster betray its surprise at discovering that its opinions were not the opinions of the people of this country—that it misunderstood the national sentiment on this lofty subject—that it had been dreaming on in a fancied belief that all England like itself gave up the Colonies as possessions hardly worth much thought, so certain was their separation into independence, and even into indifference to the mother-country. This wrathful discomfort of the 'Times' is not a little amusing. And what was it that thus stirred its anger? Not the reasonings of Mr. Forster, we venture to say, strong and vigorously expressed as they were—but his passion, his enthusiasm, the thorough impenetration of his soul by the Imperial feeling, his vehement and ardent feeling that England and the Colonies are one country. It is this which confers such immense significance on Mr. Forster's words. His views may be accurate or mistaken on endless points of detail, his arguments may not be conclusive, his sketches of the future unreal—nevertheless there is a force in his language, a power that underlies his words, that goes to the

heart of his hearers and his readers, and reveals to them how thoroughly and how naturally he feels that he is speaking of vast populations who are parts of the nation of which he is a citizen. In a Parliamentary leader so conspicuous as Mr. Forster such a spectacle was very uncomfortable for the 'Times.'

But in truth the leading journal has had no eyes for the wonderful development of the Imperial feeling which has been steadily going on for some years past in the mind of the people of England. We are not where we were ten years ago—very far from it—nor are the Colonies. Ever since this journal was established we have taken our stand on this great change of the public sentiment; we have watched its progress, and pointed out in our columns the several stages it was reaching; and our satisfaction is proportionate when we meet with such a man as Mr. Forster carried away by its force. It is often said that what we call progress in the Imperial feeling is merely a record of successive concessions to the Colonists—that we have got into the habit of giving them what they asked—that their contentment denotes merely satisfaction at their marked advance in independence—and that the thought which lies at the bottom of their minds is simply a sense that it is convenient for a little while to enjoy the protection afforded by England's strength, and that when the infant is older and strong enough to walk it will make its bow and bid farewell. To this allegation we answer, with unclouded confidence, that it conveys a complete misdescription of the real facts of the situation. Each acquisition of increased power of self-government has not been accompanied by Colonial indifference towards the mother-country. We say, on the contrary, that Colonial loyalty has warmed Colonial hearts just in proportion as they felt that their union with England was the result of the voluntary impulse of their own feelings. The more completely they manage their own affairs, the less England interferes with their own administration, the stronger, the more flourishing, the more ardent has

been the Imperial feeling. The fact is patent in the whole Colonial history of recent years ; the most casual observer may easily recognise it. The more each Colony has recognised itself to be a self-administering province, the more quickly has it gathered up the gratifying consciousness that it belonged to England and also that England belonged to it. England has discerned the emotions which glowed in Colonial hearts, and has responded with equal warmth. The agitation of the 'Times' rests on the conviction that this is the truth of the situation.

The advance of the Imperial feeling has been characterised by a marked feature. The strongest outcomes of Colonial loyalty have been brought out by administrative difficulties with England. Governors and their Councils have disputed with Legislative Assemblies ; sometimes the Imperial side has won the day, sometimes the Colonial ; yet the fact, not only of joint deliberation, but still more of political antagonism, of the collision of discordant ideas, of victory achieved after hard debate, of acquiescence in final decisions, to whichever side they have leaned—this fact, we say, has taught both sides by an unconscious process that they were one country, organically and naturally associated, interested, as Ireland and Scotland are, in the British Parliament, and accustoming all the partners in the discussions to take into account, as it were spontaneously, the views, the opinions, and the feelings of each other. A more powerful bond of union cannot easily be imagined. No Colony had warmer feuds with England than Canada ; disruption seemed to be looming on the horizon ; appeals to force were not absent ; yet what Colony now surpasses Canada in loyalty to the Empire ? England took a prominent lead in constructing the Great Dominion across the Ocean ; her counsels were listened to, her negotiations respected, her gentle pressure of moral suasion accepted, and the result is a Colony as Imperial as the mother-country. To have shared common difficulties, to have argued about them in free and even angry debate, to have appealed to a common history, a common literature, reason trained to move



in the same paths, is a most powerful creator of the sense of forming one society.

But let no one be misled by the notion that we are dealing here only with the feeling of the day, with the fashion and convenience of the hour, resting on no solid basis, and likely to be dispelled by the first blasts of caprice. The strength of the Imperial feeling is built on the solid foundation of the real and immense benefit accruing to all from the Empire. Populations knit together by sentiment only do not found great States, for great States are only possible on the basis of great advantages. Common forefathers, common traditions, similar ideas on human life, and like habits of dealing with the ever-recurring problems of human existence, have vast combining power. That they are Englishmen, at least, is a feeling deep in the Colonial heart; and if to the outward eye it is invisible, its moulding and transforming force shapes the emotions of the spirit, and through them the resulting conduct of daily affairs. Every year that rolls on quickens and spreads the interest which England takes in Colonial Parliaments, as it brings the Colonists into more vivid sympathy with the debates of our House of Commons. The tone that Colonial affairs concern England little and may be left to those who are departing, is gone, and we believe for ever; the struggle now upheaving the Cape Colony is watched with sympathetic interest all over England. Then come the vast benefits of so large a space on the terrestrial globe saved from internal war, and ever open to peaceful trade; commerce following the flag, in obedience to similarity of tastes and the prodigious force of custom; and if a colony or two lapses into the delusions and selfishnesses of Protection, what is that but a passing cloud, which the growth of intelligence will soon make to pass away? Thus, each day is surely developing the glorious result, so brightly depicted in the glowing words of Mr. Forster—‘ that our Colonies, when strong enough to be independent, will yet be stronger, more rich, more intelligent, able to be better, if still in union with ourselves; that their

inhabitants will have greater opportunities, a wider scope, a possibility of a higher career, if continuing our fellow-countrymen; that in order to fulfil all the duties of free and civilised and self-governing men, they need not cease to be British citizens; that they may have all the advantages of a nationality without disowning their allegiance, and that, as they increase in strength and power, so also shall we.' True, Mr Forster paints this as an idea: but it is an idea which is realised in fact, which witnesses steadily its ever-expanding development. And if the future is hard to conceive, if it raises up problems which task the imaginations and the reasoning faculties of the ablest statesmen to describe in their practical importance and to meet with adequate solutions, there is always the grand assurance that sufficient for each day are its difficulties and methods of escaping them, that in every living political organism there dwells the power in each succeeding generation to maintain and expand the national life. Constitutions grow if they are to last; they cannot be sketched beforehand. The Constitution of England has come down triumphantly through the ages because the tasks imposed by each step in civilisation were met by the resources of each revolving period. Who could have foretold a thousand years ago the Queen, Lords, and Commons by which the might of England, the order and happiness of the English people, are guided and controlled at the present hour? Was there ever amongst any people a Constitution less preconceived by political sagacity, or more markedly the child of the contributions which each age made to its structure? So will it be with the British Empire of the future. Of that Empire we can say to-day, what we have said repeatedly on previous occasions, that its success in combining the fullest local self-government with strong Imperial cohesion forms a new and most wonderful chapter in political philosophy. Yet what is it but practical aptitude and tact, and not scientific deduction and prescription, which has accomplished this great achievement? The great lesson to learn and practise to day is

to discern and defend the vast advantages of union ; each danger and difficulty overcome gives a new and powerful instrument for dealing with the exigencies of the morrow.

---

No. XI.

IMPERIAL CONFEDERATION.

*Leader from 'THE COLONIES,' November 27, 1875.*

OUR readers will remember the correspondence which appeared in our columns nearly three years ago, with respect to the practicability of ultimately establishing a system of Federal Government representing the whole Empire and managing all affairs of Imperial importance. The value of occasionally discussing such a subject must be obvious ; it must do much good in the way of familiarising the public mind of the Empire with the idea that our vast dominions will one day be united, not only by the present ties of affection and common interest, but also by some political organisation which will give strength and practical cohesion to these sentimental and material bonds of unity. Mr. Forster's address having so warmly and widely evoked the profound national feeling in favour of the permanent unity of the Empire, we think the time has again arrived when some further answer should be given to those who ask what practical shape is the future political organisation of our Empire to assume. The most decided believers in the possibility of an ultimate Federal union of the Empire most decidedly object to the question being considered as a mere abstract theory or speculation ; their wish is that it should be borne in mind as a great

---

practical object to be attained. In considering Imperial Confederation it must ever be remembered that we are discussing that which is not abstract and ideal, but which has been an existing form of government at most periods of the world's history, both ancient and modern, and which is at the present moment the established government of two of the greatest powers in the world. To discuss Imperial Confederation is therefore to consider, not a speculation or a theory, but the practical extension to our own Empire of a clearly defined, well understood, and applied form of government.

In a letter which we publish in another column Mr. Frederick Young does not hesitate—and we do not see why those who think as he does should fear to speak out as he has done—to say plainly that the permanent unity of the Empire means nothing less than the future organisation of a complete Federal system which shall be the same as those already in existence, only applied on a larger scale than the world has yet seen; and that means that our Empire will become politically, as it is already in extent and breadth of interests and sympathies, the greatest power that has yet appeared on earth. Mr. Young calls the change which will bring about this consummation ‘radical,’ and he probably will at first take away the breath from some timid folks; but they must soon be reassured if they only follow him, as he shows from past British history how, by a radical but constructive change, England first emerged from the Heptarchy. In like manner, by ‘radical,’ but constructive and conservative changes, Scotland and Ireland became first dynastically connected with England, and afterwards, by the establishment of one common Parliament, the United Kingdom was finally constituted as we now have it. It was only at the beginning of this very century that the last radical change in this constructive process was effected. The development of the British Empire into a Confederation must of course be completed at a more rapid rate, for we live in an era when growth of population and commerce in new lands, when means of communication

and information, when everything affecting the relations of communities, and facilitating intercourse between them, has partaken somewhat of the rapidity of that electric spark which 'annihilates distance.'

When we come to consider the proposal that Confederation—this practical, tried system of government, which is not, as so many people imagine, a mere speculation and a theory—should be ultimately applied to the British Empire, what does it amount to? Simply that we should make up our minds that when the growth of the Colonies requires that they shall be admitted to a share in the management of the affairs of the Empire, a practical organisation will be provided for the purpose; and Imperial Federalists, like Mr. Young—disclaiming all idea of inventing any new form of government, or of indulging in speculation or theory—point to this existing system which is at work before their very eyes, and say—Here is a model of what will be required for the British Empire, and which can be adapted to its future permanent organisation. It certainly does not require a romantic turn of mind to believe that the British race, which both in the mother-country and the Colonies has so easily adapted its political institutions to its wants, will be able to command sufficient statesmanship to adapt the well-known form of Federal government to the future requirements of the Empire.

When Mr. Young tells us that, besides the existing Parliament and Executive of the United Kingdom, it will be necessary to create a separate Imperial Parliament and Executive, he merely asserts that England, in order to maintain her Empire, must do that which Germany and the United States have done in order to preserve their position as great Powers. Without interfering with the Colonies in their provincial self-government, nor allowing them to interfere with hers, the mother-country shall, in an Imperial sense, regard them, to use our correspondent's expression, as 'extensions of the old country'—'counties of England'—or, as we should rather express it,

England and the Colonies should regard each other as counties of the one Empire.

To such a proposal as Confederation only two objections of any serious difficulty are raised—one that the present English Parliament would not consent to hand over Imperial affairs to a Parliament of the Empire, and become itself merely the Provincial Parliament of the United Kingdom, standing in a position like that held by the Diet of Prussia or Bavaria to the Diet of the German Empire; and the other objection is the great distance separating various portions of the British dominions.

It is not to be supposed that, on the first suggestion of such a thing, the English Parliament would be prepared to hand over to a Parliament of the Empire the control of Imperial questions. The idea is one, however, which may well be cultivated, and finally command assent by being taken into early consideration. That which an English Parliament would now instantly repudiate may well find favour with one of another generation when the Colonies shall have attained such a growth as to be more on a footing of equality with the mother-country. Thus we can appreciate the benefits which may result from the timely consideration and occasional discussion of the future organisation of the Empire.

In a few words Mr. Young meets the objection of distance which has been frequently answered. Professor Thorold Rogers, who on other grounds avows his disbelief in Imperial Confederation, considers that it is of no weight as against that system. Mr. Edward Jenkins, in his able essays showing the practicability of Confederation, has answered the objection: Mr. Eddy and Mr. Labilliere, in their papers published in the last volume of the 'Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute,' also expose its weakness. It is ably disposed of by an Australian contemporary, the 'Border Post,' which, in a review of Mr. Labilliere's paper, says:—'The distance should be eliminated from the argument, for it is a well-known fact that, not many years ago,

when Port Philip, now the Colony of Victoria, formed a district of New South Wales, the two members for the Portland Bay district were often more than a period of two months on their journey in sailing vessels to the city of Sydney, where the Parliament assembled. With the greatly improved and improving means of communication, we must endorse the opinion that distance must be eliminated

Self-interest must undoubtedly strongly urge permanent unity by conferring on all portions of the Empire the *maximum* of strength and security in pursuing their careers of local prosperity, with the *minimum* of contribution and concession to a Federal union for purposes of common defence and external policy. The argument of self-interest as applied to defence is thus forcibly illustrated in the article of our New South Wales contemporary just quoted :—

‘During the present session of the Parliament of New South Wales, sums amounting in the aggregate to upwards of 100,000*l.* have been voted for the pay and warlike stores for the standing army of that Colony—an army which, though it musters 101 men, can only, if required, bring 30 men to the battle-field to repel the forces of an invading army. This annual expenditure is absolutely thrown away, but if devoted as pointed out by Mr. Labilliere, then indeed it would be spent wisely, and we should enjoy greater security.’ Local self-interest, if not blinded by local conceit and jealousy in England and the Colonies, must clearly perceive that the cheapest and vastly most effective system of security and defence will be one in which all the dominions of the Empire shall equitably contribute their shares to a common fund, to be raised and expended by a common Legislature and Executive, which must necessarily have the control of external affairs out of which peace and war may arise. The amount of taxation which such a Legislature would have to impose on the Empire to keep up its defences in the highest state of efficiency would be a mere cypher—a mere fraction of what the various local Parliaments would have to impose on

their people should they attempt separately to provide for their own defences.

Such matter-of-fact, arithmetical, unromantic considerations as these lead men with sufficient practical foresight to reasonably calculate what will be our requirements a few years hence, to the conclusion that we must prepare for the application to our Empire of a system of government which has already met the wants of other nations in this particular; and Mr. Young only argues from the past history and experience of our British people when he tells us that the same political capacity which has so admirably provided them with institutions suitable to the various stages of their past career, will enable them to adopt and expand the system of Confederation to the larger and grander requirements of the greater Empire into which they are so fast developing.

---

No. XII.

COLONISTS AS FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN.

*Letter signed 'A PARIAN,' from 'THE COLONIES,'  
November 27, 1875.*

THE reading of Mr. Forster's address at Edinburgh and your article upon it set me a-thinking—I thought of . . . , I thought of . . . , I thought that . . . , I thought how . . . , and I thought that perhaps I had better not say what I thought, but content myself with expressing the strong feelings of gratification that I experience on witnessing the immense change that has come over the views of the leading members of the



late Liberal Government since they have had leisure to study the Colonial question from the calm retirement of the Opposition benches, and the hope that a slight change in the current of public opinion will not induce them to 'bout ship, and go on the other and more accustomed tack.

There is, however, one sentence in Mr. Forster's address that is worthy of more than a mere passing notice, whether it is acted upon or not. That sentence is:—'We ought to take every opportunity of showing that we consider the Colonists our countrymen, and every Colony part of the common country.' It is not many years ago that 'Sam Slick' wrote—'The organisation is wrong. They are two people, not one. It shouldn't be England and her Colonies, but they should be integral parts of one great whole—all counties of Great Britain . . . All distinctions be blotted out for ever. It should be no more a bar to a man's promotion, as it is now, that he lived beyond the seas, than living the other side of the Channel. It should be our navy, our army, our nation. That's a great word, but the English keep it to themselves, and colonists have no nationality. They have no place, no station, no rank . . . They are a mixed race: they have no blood. They are like our free niggers: they are emancipated, but they haven't the same social position as the whites. The fetters are off, but the caste, as they call it in India, remains—*Colonists are the Pariahs of the Empire.*' Thus, in the bitterness of his heart, wrote a man who was actuated by the true Imperial spirit, though he had the misfortune, if only by adoption, to be a Colonist. Now there is not one word, in the above extract, that might not be written at this present day, as applicable to more than three-fourths of the people of England. They take the money of the Colonists, charge them, when they get a chance, some fifty per cent. more for everything than they charge other people, get all they can out of them, and then with a contemptuous toss of the head dismiss them with the one word *Colonial*. However, in future, we are to have the honour of being regarded as 'countrymen.'

How, let me ask, is this new regard to be shown? Is employment in the public service to be opened to Colonists? I shall be told that it is open at the present time; that any Colonist, equally with anyone else, can enter for a competitive examination; yes, true, but then promotion goes by merit, that means, kissing goes by favour, much as it did in our younger days, and being a stranger in a foreign land, what chance has a Colonist against a cadet of one of 'the families,' whether it is Whig or Tory, which happens to be in power. 'Sam Slick' is right, it should be *Our Nation* that is the true Imperial principle; let colonists be regarded as *Englishmen*, not merely as *countrymen*, which latter term means something like *country cousin* to a Londoner, a sort of nuisance that has to be tolerated occasionally, taken to see the sights, the British Museum, Astleys (or to be more precise, *Hastleys*), and Madame Tussaud's, lunched and dined once or twice, and then shunted, as soon, and as politely as possible. Yes, I repeat it should be *Our Nation*, that is the true Federal principle; it is those two words *Our Nation*, which, when they are understood in England, and those other words *I'm an Englishman*, which, when Colonists learn that they form, in substance and in fact, a part of the birthright of every Anglo-Saxon subject of her Majesty, will bind those subjects in every part of the world together with bonds stronger than bonds of steel, and then, when we have the 'common nationality,' there will be no difficulty in maintaining 'allegiance to one monarch,' and a 'mutual alliance in all relations with foreign Powers.' The prospect is better than it was a few years ago; the great difficulty to contend with is the insular prejudice of Englishmen; and it will take another generation to remove this, but in the meantime, men who think with Mr. Forster, and desire to give effect to the sentiment contained in his words (which I have quoted above) might do a great deal by opening the public service and the paths to distinction which it, *and it alone*, affords, to Colonists as well as to Englishmen; and I do not hesitate to say that the fact that

one Colonist had risen to distinction in the English public service would do more to unite England and her Colonies as one great whole than any other course that could be adopted. A few naval cadetships have been, occasionally, placed at the disposal of Colonial Governors, and at first these were a great deal sought after; but when Colonists found that their sons could not get on in the service without that interest and influence which they did not possess, they ceased to care much about them. Again, service in the Colonies does not count as service at home. See the strange position in which the military officer lately selected by the Government of Canada has been placed by the Imperial Government. His service in instructing our Canadian *countrymen* to defend themselves is not to be considered as service to his Imperial mistress, but he is to be in the position of being lent to a foreign Government; so that not only will his Canadian service be a bar to his promotion, but he will see his place in the Imperial service taken by some one else, and, when he desires to return to England, will probably find that he has been 'retired' by some economical Government order. This is a nice, practical example of the way in which the Imperial Government expounds Mr. Forster's doctrine that 'we ought to take every opportunity of showing that we consider the Colonists our countrymen, and every Colony part of the common country.' Even in the matter of honours, when an old Mediterranean order is routed out and furbished up, avowedly solely for the benefit of Colonial *countrymen*, it is crowded at once with Downing Street hangers-on and by men who owe their appointment to English influence, and not to Colonial service. It is a 'partnership,' is it, between English countrymen and Colonial countrymen? I do not think that it is, or ever will be, a 'partnership;' that is not the right term to apply. A partnership involves rights and liabilities that cannot be applied to such a case or to such a position. But it may be more than a mere partnership; it may be the grandest Federation of States that the world has ever seen, each State adminis-

tering its own affairs and making its own laws, but having, in all other matters, rights and privileges co-extensive and co-equal with those of the other States, the whole together forming the great Empire of England, yielding allegiance to the same Queen, speaking the same language, and worshipping the same God. To such an Empire every Colonist would be proud to belong, and would feel that when he came to England he was, in truth, regarded as a fellow-countryman, and not as a 'pariah.'

---

No. XIII.

COLONIAL GOVERNORS AND COLONIAL  
FEDERATION.

*From a Leader in the 'TIMES,' May 1, 1875.*

THE vast regions over which Sir George Bowen's constitutional sway has extended are, indeed, a possession of which any empire might be proud. We find in Australia Proper the most rapid material advance the world has ever witnessed, and we feel, at the same time, that what has been done is but a small instalment of the greater progress which coming years will bring with them in their course. Look, therefore, in what direction we will throughout the 'Australian group of Colonies,' the prospect is everywhere encouraging. We see a growing nation, or, rather, cluster of nations, each of them already in advance of the smaller States of Europe, and making up together a really great and formidable Power. They are still in their infancy, but it is the infancy of a veritable Hercules, and promises well for the vigour of their approaching manhood.

They are growing fast in wealth and population and intelligence. They are well governed, and are content under a system which allows them a principal share in the control of their own destinies. In fact, they possess or are on the road to attain everything that is a proof and cause of national prosperity; and they are not ungrateful to the mother-country, to whose fostering care they ascribe, with truth, a great portion of their blessings. A love for England, a genuine loyalty to the British Crown, and a sense of mutual interest are the light bonds which at present unite them with ourselves and with one another, and, whatever new form these may take, it is not in the nature of things that such a yoke should be easily broken or cast aside. They are, we believe, not likely to desert us willingly, and we are sure that we ourselves shall be most unwilling to throw them off. We will not quite say that we cannot do without one another, but we may safely assert that both parties to the connection will find their best interest in maintaining it, and as long as that is the case we may look with confidence to the future no less than with hearty satisfaction to the present. Other nations than our own may boast of their achievements in war, or of the more than doubtful gain of provinces which they have wrested from their neighbours, and which they must hold still by the same arts by which they acquired them. We have been occupied with the nobler and safer task of the creation of a new world; we have spread our name and language over regions vaster by far than any which others have appropriated, and we find in all of them willing confederates, proud to maintain their relation with us, and anxious to draw still more closely the ties which unite them with their distant home. We have learnt lessons from one another already, as each has been successful in solving problems in which the other may have failed. Just as India has been our school for War, so also our Colonies have been our school for Empire. The ranks, too, of our home statesmen have been largely and usefully recruited by those who have gained their

experience at a distance, or are now, in the temporary want of work at home, employing themselves abroad in learning the arts of government, and the true way in which a free people may be preserved in prosperity and contentment.

It was natural that Sir George Bowen should say something of the future destiny of the nations over which he has presided. Their past growth has been so rapid, and their prospects have become so splendid, that the question suggests itself whether their relations with us are likely to be maintained permanently on their present footing, and whether States which have grown already to be almost the rivals of their mother-country will be always satisfied to continue as her mere dependencies. To let well alone for the present is the substance of Sir George Bowen's very sensible advice. The Australian Colonies are, he assures us, thoroughly loyal and attached to their mother-country. The time may come when they will desire to be more closely united with her, and to be admitted to a share in the government of an empire of which they will be no mean part. The matter, however, though a most important one, and one which may possibly come forward before our own generation has passed away, is not yet pressing itself practically upon our notice. Nor is Sir George Bowen ready with any comprehensive scheme for the closer union of the Colonies with one another—a thing which he admits may be desirable, but which he thinks it would be foolish to attempt to force on before its time. Australia, happily for herself, lies so far away from the stormy atmosphere of Europe, and she has so little reason to apprehend danger from the near presence of a too powerful neighbour, that she can safely go on for a while as she has gone on hitherto, and may continue to be a system of States rather than a single great Power, in the absence of any danger which could make union necessary. The Canadian Bund has been formed in some degree under pressure from the United States; but Australia is under no such constraining influence, and she can afford to wait upon events, and need not anticipate

them by a policy for which the circumstances have not yet occurred. It may be well, even so, that all these matters should be sometimes discussed; and there can be at least no harm in the endeavour to familiarise ourselves with the notion of a vast united Empire, in which the remote dependencies in the far-off East and West will find a place, and of which the old country will be the centre and the common link of union. For some time yet it can only be a dream, but it is a dream which we are the better for indulging in, and the day in which it will be fulfilled literally may be nearer than any of us suppose. It is something meanwhile to be assured that events are at any rate proceeding in the right direction. Whatever may be our relations with our Australian Colonies fifty or a hundred years hence, we cannot be wrong now in keeping up a loyal union between all the distant members of the Greater Britain that is to be. There can be no possibility of error in such a policy as this. It is quite possible that Sir George Bowen and our other Colonial Governors may be preparing the way for the grandest Federation of States the world has witnessed, but we are sure anyhow that their present services are useful, and we observe with pleasure that they are recognised, as they deserve, as often as the occasion presents itself.

---

## No. XIV.

## THE COLONIES IN TIME OF WAR.

*Letter from MR. H. B. T. STRANGWAYS to the  
RIGHT HON. B. DISRAELI, M.P.*

*From the 'EDINBURGH COURANT.'*

THE following important communication was lately made to Mr. Disraeli by a former Colonial Minister, whose opinions have great weight in Australia. It has been acknowledged with thanks, and will no doubt receive careful consideration at the Colonial Office. The subject to which it refers has been frequently discussed in the Colonies, but we fear is very little understood at home :—

5 Pump Court, Temple, E.C., May 31, 1876.

Sir,—As you have more than once stated that it is the policy of your Government to 'consolidate the Empire' of England, I venture to bring forward a subject of very great importance, and one on which it appears to me that the maintenance of the empire of England will, in respect to her great Colonial possessions, eventually depend—that is, the relations that will exist between England and her Colonies in time of war.

It is not many years ago that when South Australia, which Colony was then paying a large proportion of the cost of the small body of troops then stationed there, applied to the Imperial Government to be informed whether, if the Colony paid for the troops in time of peace, their presence could be depended on in time of war, received a reply to the effect that no such guarantee could be given; and the Australian Colonies generally were allowed to understand that if they should desire



to become altogether independent, England would not stand in the way of the realisation of their wishes.

It was not the policy of the Government of that day to 'consolidate the Empire;' but I think, from what I see and hear, that there is no part of the policy of the Conservative Government that commands such strong and general approval as that of consolidating the empire. I do not see that, in time of peace, any question will arise that is likely to cause any desire on the part of the people of the colonies to shake off the ties that now bind them to the mother-country. Circumstances, however, may arise to cause them, and especially the people of those colonies possessing representative institutions and responsible government, to consider very carefully the position in which they may be placed by the action of the Imperial Government in respect to matters in which they (the Colonists) have, or think they have, no interest, on which they are not consulted, and as to which they have no voice. Such a matter can, I submit, be most conveniently considered at a time when feelings of irritation at the action of any of the parties interested, or of alarm at the consequences of such action, will not interfere with the calm decision of the question on its intrinsic merits. England is now at peace with all the world—that is with all those nations commonly included in the term 'all the world'—and is therefore in a position to consider whether any and what change in her relations with her Colonial possessions would be desirable, or be willingly permitted to take place, if war was to break out between England and any of the other great nations. I must here say that I bring this subject forward, not as a mere idle question, but as a question that, I know, has been the subject of grave and serious consideration, and as a subject that must be discussed and decided, if England and her vast possessions are to continue as one great united empire.

The three great groups of self-governing colonies—America, Africa, and Australia—contain now about 8,000,000 of inhabitants (excluding aborigines); and I am sure that you, sir, will not

consider it unreasonable that those persons should feel that it is, to say the least, somewhat unsatisfactory that they should be liable to be plunged into all the horrors of war, on account of matters in which they may consider that they have no concern, or on account of proceedings which they might be more disposed to censure than to support, but in respect to which they are not allowed, having no voice in the conduct of the Imperial Government, to express any opinion; for whilst the humblest voter on any electoral roll in England can, through his representative in Parliament, bring his views before the Government and his influence to bear on their action, these 8,000,000 colonists, subjects of Her Majesty, have no voice whatever on a subject of the most vital importance to them, and which may lead to the taking of their lives, and the destruction of their property, not from any action or fault of their own, or of their own Government, but solely because they are subjects of the Queen of England.

This, sir, is a question for a statesman to deal with, and one upon which the maintenance of the great Colonial empire of England will ultimately depend. These Colonies have grown into importance, many of them have come into existence, since the last great maritime war in which England was engaged (for the Crimean war was under circumstances which prevented Russia from injuring the Colonies); and the action of England towards her Colonies three-quarters of a century ago cannot safely be taken as a precedent for the future; nor will it suffice to say in an offhand manner to these Colonists, 'You are subjects of the Queen of England, and you must take all the consequences of such connection,' for such a statement would at once suggest the action to be taken to avoid those consequences—action that would only be hastened by such offhand and unreasonable treatment.

Although it would not constitute a full or final settlement of this question, I believe that a great deal of good would result from the formation of a Council, of advice not of control,

to sit with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and consider with him all questions of joint Imperial and Colonial interest. The members of such a Council, or a large proportion of them, should be appointed or recommended by the respective Colonial Governments, for if selected by the Imperial Government, the Council would not be considered to represent colonial interests, and would consequently have no influence in the Colonies.

The simple recognition by the Imperial Government of the principle that those subjects of Her Majesty, whose lot it may be to reside in and belong to her Colonial possessions, are not simply because they are Colonists, to be deprived of all voice upon matters of general Imperial interest, and by which they may be more materially affected than any of the inhabitants of this island, would of itself, in my humble judgment, do a great deal towards strengthening the ties between England and her Colonies.

I am aware, from experience, that in politics, though you may at any time advance, you can seldom retreat, and therefore would not suggest the adoption of a course the failure of which might cause any serious inconvenience ; but whilst the establishment of such a Council would, I believe, do great good, yet, if it should fail in its working, no harm would be done ; but it appears to me that out of it would grow a solution of the important question that is the object of this letter.

As, in my opinion, the policy that you have declared to be the policy of the political party of which you are the head—namely, to ‘consolidate the Empire’—is a wise and statesman-like policy, and one that should receive the support of every true Englishman, I take the liberty of directing your attention to the only question that, as it appears to me, is likely to cause any very serious difference between England and her great Colonial possessions—a question, however, that has arisen, and may arise again at any moment.

**S. W. SILVER & CO.'S HANDBOOK to AUSTRALIA and  
NEW ZEALAND, including the FIJI ISLANDS.**

Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged, Crown 8vo. limp cloth, with Coloured Map, price 5s.

'The Compilers have evidently been careful to make this book suitable to all classes and interests and to arrange its matter so as to anticipate all possible inquiries. The principal attraction of the book undoubtedly is that it is a valuable collection of suggestive facts, unalloyed by any local prejudices. The historical and geological portions of the chapter devoted to this Colony are extremely interesting and instructive.'—*SYDNEY MORNING HERALD*.

'The information given with regard to each Colony is very well digested and copious. Respecting our own Colony, we find a well written history of its discovery and gradual exploration, and a clear and impartial *résumé* of its capabilities as a field, not only for emigration, but for investment. The book is not a mere emigrant's guide, but comprises a quantity of information, excellently collated, which will be found useful even to colonists of long standing, and is, in fact, the most handy gazetteer of the Colonies with which we are acquainted. In the endeavour to exercise a double impartiality—to balance the advantages and disadvantages of emigration compared with life in the Old Country, and, at the same time, to do equal justice as between the Australian and New Zealand Colonies, it appears to us Silver & Co. have signally succeeded.'—*BRISBANE COURIER*.

'The Compiler has devoted impartial attention to each Colony, and points out the advantages they possess as fields of emigration.'—*HOBART TOWN MERCURY*.

'The work gives, in a convenient form, the latest and most accurate information regarding the various Colonies of Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand. All the facts are given soberly and drily; without any attempt at enthusiastic description or the graces of style. This, we are convinced, must be to the advantage of the intending emigrant, who has been too often misled by highly-coloured and attractive descriptions.'—*ATHENÆUM*.

*Now Ready.*

**S. W. SILVER & CO.'S HANDBOOK to SOUTH AFRICA,  
including CAPE COLONY—NATAL—The DIAMOND FIELDS—TRANS-ORANGE  
REPUBLICS, &c. With ILLUSTRATIONS.**

Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged, Crown 8vo. price 10s.

'This publication is one of considerable value. It affords much general and local information about South Africa, as well as forming a handy book of reference, for which latter purpose it is well qualified by the capital method of arrangement observed throughout.'—*THE FIELD*.

'A book rich in facts, well arranged, and diligently worked out.'—*MITTHIELUNGEN*.

'It should be consulted by all who seek information concerning the British Colonies and the Dutch Republics in that region of the world.'—*ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS*.

'The paper on Ostrich Farming presents facts of a novel character. The Gazetteer is a most valuable addition, giving as it does an account of every town and village, and every natural feature of the country possessed of a name.'—*EMPIRE*.

'We must refer our readers to the book itself for an able and exhaustive description of the climate, which, as has long been known, is, on account of the dryness of the air, specially suited to persons affected with chronic pulmonary disorders.'—*LANCET*.

'The requirements of intending settlers—to whom these Colonies offer a most promising field of enterprise—have been specially considered; and the sportsman anxious to try the "best shooting ground in the world," the merchant eager to extend his business, and indeed every one desirous of gaining some knowledge of one of the most rapidly advancing of British Colonies, will find this volume a mine of information.'—*ATHENÆUM*.

'Silver has become the Murray of our Colonies.'—*BROAD ARROW*.

**QUEENSLAND the PROGRESSIVE. By a FORTY YEARS'  
COLONIST. With Map. Price 1s.**

'Messrs. Silver & Co. are gradually issuing quite a library of Colonial Handbooks, many of which are interesting, and all useful. "Queensland the Progressive" is by a Mr. White, who seems to have the merit, at all events, of knowing the country thoroughly.'—*AUSTRALASIAN*.

'We can commend this book highly for the fulness and trustworthy character of its information.'—*GRAPHIC*.

**COLONIAL MAPS.**

**AFRICA—TROPICAL AND SOUTH.—A NEW MAP** of the British Colonies and Adjacent Territories, with Routes of Railways in the South, and including the Discoveries of LIVINGSTONE, CAMERON, &c. Coloured, price 2s. 6d.


**AUSTRALIA and NEW ZEALAND—Including the Fiji Islands.** Showing Divisions, Chief Towns, Rivers, Explorers' Routes, &c. Size 14½ ins. by 9½ ins. Coloured, price 1s.


'A beautiful and simple map.'—*ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS*.

**SEASONS-CHART of the WORLD, indicating also the Principal Routes of Commerce, Rainfall, &c. Coloured, price 1s.**

S. W. SILVER & CO., 66 and 67 Cornhill, London, E.C.







BOUND BY  
SPOTTISWOODE & CO  
LONDON





