

COLONIZATION.

A LECTURE

DELIVERED AT THE

WINDSOR AND ETON LITERARY, SCIENTIFIC, AND
MECHANICS' INSTITUTION,

BY THE

REV. W. G. COOKESLEY, A. M.,

OF ETON COLLEGE,

ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER THE 19TH, 1849.

WINDSOR: W. WILLMORE, THAMES STREET.

LONDON: J. RIDGWAY, 169, PICCADILLY.

PREFACE.

For many of my views on the subject of Colonization, I am indebted to Mr. Wakefield's book, and to the Works of my esteemed and regretted friend, the late Charles Buller. I make this preliminary statement, to obviate the necessity of special and more particular acknowledgments of obligation.

Eton,
December 20th, 1849.

LECTURE.

SOME few months ago, I ventured to deliver a lecture on Political Economy, before this Institution; and I did so, *not* because I fancied myself authorized by the depth of my acquaintance with the subject, to lecture on it; but because I believed that there are many elementary truths and fundamental propositions in Political Economy, which it is of the last importance to the well-being of society, that the mechanic—the labourer—the artisan—should understand. In undertaking to address you this evening on the subject of Colonization, I have been guided by similar motives: not because I feel myself qualified for the task, but because it is a subject of deep interest to *all* classes, more especially to those classes which furnish the majority of members to such an Institution as this.

The question of Colonization has within the last few years claimed and gained a consideration in the public mind, which it had not enjoyed for many years before. Juster and more adequate ideas of its immense importance, are beginning to be entertained. People are becoming sensible of the value of a sound system of Colonization, as no contemptible or insignificant

remedy for many of the crying evils under which we are now labouring. The present time may be regarded as the *turning* point in the question; if a right direction is now given to Colonization, it is difficult to say *what* amount of national advantage and individual happiness may not thereby be produced: but if the favourable opportunity is lost, and no advantage is taken of popular feeling, to enforce a sound, comprehensive, and grand system of Colonization, it is impossible to calculate the amount of mischief and calamity which assuredly awaits, and must eventually overtake us. Allow me to give a cursory glance at the most famous of ancient colonies, in order that we may understand the motives and principles on which they were undertaken and regulated.

The Phœnicians are the earliest colonists with whom history has made us acquainted. The cities of Phœnicia, Tyre and Sidon especially, were at a very early period famous for their wealth. Their skill in arts and manufactures was unrivalled. You may remember how much use was made of Tyrian artificers in the building of Solomon's temple. Ezekiel (c. 27) gives a very extraordinary picture of the trading activity and enterprize of Tyre.

But Phœnicia, which contained such a crowd of towns, distinguished for manufactures, commerce, and wealth, was a narrow strip of country, not more than 150 miles long, and not more than 20 miles in breadth. The population of these thriving towns was constantly pressing against the means of subsistence, and this

evil was systematically and successfully obviated by sending out colonies.

The Phœnicians were the first mariners who explored the entire Mediterranean Sea, and were the first to venture beyond the Straits of Gibraltar. At a very early period, possibly as early as the building of Solomon's Temple, B. C. 1015, they founded the city of Cadiz—probably the oldest town in existence in western Europe, and certainly the town which has retained its original name the longest. From Cadiz, the Tyrians seem to have carried their trade as far northward as Britain; they are supposed to have traded in tin with the Scilly Islands; and it is possible that Start Point in Devonshire received its name from the Phœnician goddess, Ashtoreth or Astarte. Southward they traded along the western coast of Africa, to the distance of thirty days' sail; and established factories and trading towns on the coast of the modern empire of Morocco. On the northern coast of Africa they founded the city of Utica, as early, probably, as they founded Cadiz: less than two centuries subsequently they built the more famous city of Carthage, besides forming many other African and Spanish settlements.

In founding these vast establishments the Phœnicians gave profitable employment to redundant capital and population; but they do not seem to have wished to exercise any controlling authority over their colonies: their connexion was the result of affection—the necessary fruit of similitude of habits, feelings, tastes, and wants, existing between branches of the same stock.

The colonies of Phœnicia no doubt represented the form of government, and were in all respects copies of the civil, social, and religious condition of the mother country. This was the real ground of the attachment which united the colony to the metropolis.

On two remarkable occasions the strength of that attachment was conspicuously displayed. Cambyses, king of Persia, in the zenith of his power, was resolved on the subjugation of Carthage; but the Phœnicians, —by whose fleet alone he could execute his purpose—steadily and sternly refused to take part against their colony. Two centuries afterwards, when Tyre was besieged by Alexander the Great, the women and children of that city found a refuge from destruction at Carthage. One more remark on these Phœnician colonies. The *judgment* with which the *situations* for their cities were chosen, was unerring; and the establishments founded by them seem without exception to have flourished, and grown into important trading communities.

The Greeks were neither as early, as bold, nor as adventurous mariners as the Phœnicians. Their colonies were confined to the countries whose shores were washed by the waters of their own seas—the Ægean and Ionian. It was not till at a comparatively late period that they ventured to the west of Sicily, or the south of Crete. But the colonization of the Greeks forms one of the most wonderful chapters in the history of that wonderful people. One is absolutely amazed at the accounts of the wealth, the splendour, the power

of these Greek colonies. Within a comparatively short space of time, Greek colonies covered both shores of the Ægean, and the southern shore of the Black Sea. Sicily and the southern coasts of Italy were thronged with Greek cities of astonishing wealth and grandeur: the ruins of many of these towns still strike the traveller with astonishment and awe. Alexander the Great achieved the crowning triumph of Greek colonization by founding Alexandria in Egypt.

It was mainly by her colonies that Greece propagated her literature and language. The Old Testament was first translated into Greek at Alexandria, for the sake of the Jews who spoke that language, and who were tempted by commerce and the hope of gain, to settle in great numbers in that city: and so the contents of the Bible first became known to the learned Greeks. At the period when the Gospels were written, Greek had become the general language of educated men in Europe; and its universality—humanly speaking—greatly facilitated the spread of Christianity.

These Greek colonies which produced such vast and important results, were founded sometimes by mere bands of adventurers, whom distress drove from home. More commonly, however, they were sent out by regular and solemn commission from the parent city. The mother city took care that men of high birth and great ability should lead the colony, which was to be a faithful reflection and copy of herself. The closest identity of religious sentiment and worship was always maintained between the two: leaders of colonies were after

death, commonly worshipped as demi-gods. So great was the reverence which the Greeks paid to the founders of colonies ! and so awful was the character with which popular feeling, however misguided and erroneous, invested them !

The Romans, in their mode of colonization, exemplified and enforced that steady and undeviating plan of aggrandizement, which seems to have been the great purpose and thought of that remarkable people, from the earliest period of their existence as an organized state. As fast as they enlarged their frontier, they multiplied their colonies : their Italian municipalities were so many outposts and advanced garrisons to the metropolis ; they repeatedly saved Rome from destruction, especially in the great Hannibalian war. The Romans uniformly planted colonies in the countries which they subdued : but the idea they had of a colony, was simply that it was to serve as the means of maintaining and consolidating the imperial authority of the mother city ; and their establishments were admirably adapted for their purpose.

In modern history, the Spaniards and Portuguese have been the most conspicuous foreign colonizers : but their system has exhibited a pre-eminent specimen of failure ; nor do they demand more enlarged reference.

I now come to our national colonization. Two considerations present themselves to our mind instantly, and almost spontaneously, when we contemplate colonization in reference to its consequences to England ; the first is, its necessity ; the second, its facility. It

is impossible for a man of serious thought to survey the present social condition of this country, without the most anxious and painful solicitude. We present the shocking, but admitted anomaly, of enormous riches existing together with excessive, debasing, and grinding poverty. This anomaly arises from two principal causes: the first is, the fact that your enormous capital has not space to work in; it is employed in too narrow and restricted a field. There is consequently an excessive competition of capital with capital; and the consequence of *this* is that men can get very little interest for their money. They are therefore induced to embark their capital in the wildest and most extravagant speculations. Very many millions of British capital have been thrown away in loans to foreign states; which states, without absolutely disowning their debts, nevertheless have not discharged, and moreover never had much probability, if they had much intention, of discharging them. Millions have been sunk in Mexican mines—foreign railroads—and all this capital which has been thus lost, might, if diverted into proper channels, have produced immense profits to the capitalist, and incalculable advantages to the empire. It would seem hardly credible, but is nevertheless true, that our colonies present an almost boundless field for the profitable investment of capital, at the same time that capital is being so miserably and insantly wasted in other directions; yet such is undoubtedly the fact. What are *some* of the causes at least, which have hindered, and do still hinder the

application of British capital to its best and most lucrative purpose, I hope to be able to explain in the course of my succeeding remarks. At the same time that the profits of capital are so exceedingly small, in consequence of intense competition, the profits of labour are so low, that no one possessed of common humanity and generosity, can contemplate the condition of the labourer, without feelings of the greatest and acutest distress.

The low price of labour arises from the same cause that has produced low profits of capital, viz. excessive competition; in other words—there are many times more labourers than you can employ; and this evil is annually becoming worse; for our population increases much faster than our capital. Within twenty-five years after the conclusion of the last great war with France, the population of Great Britain was increased by the sum of six millions. We are still increasing at the rate of more than 300,000 people a year. Now, although our capital is also increasing, it does not increase in anything like a corresponding degree: and though I have every disposition to look on the bright side of the picture, and to hope for the best in a bad matter, yet I cannot disguise from myself the truth, that bad as the condition of the labourer is, there is every probability of its becoming still worse; the causes that produce his misery are still in active operation, and every year must aggravate their intensity.

The true and only real *permanent* remedy for this excessive competition of labour, this competition by

which the poor starve and ruin each other, must be found in an improvement of their *moral government*. But such a result, if ever produced, must be the work of time, and would require for its production a general amount of knowledge—just and patriotic views—enlarged and liberal philanthropy—in the higher and middle orders of society, such as at present they do not possess.

But, in the meantime, the evil is urgent, and an *immediate* remedy is demanded. In our vast colonial possessions an almost boundless market may be opened for labour; at the same time, no country has such *facility* for transporting labour and capital from one part of the globe to another, as England; our insular position, and vast commercial marine, give us extraordinary advantages.

There can be no doubt that to take labour from a place where it is *not* wanted, and to remove it to a place it *is* wanted, must be a great benefit to both places. Nor is there any doubt that our colonies could find ample and profitable employment for a vast multitude of our supernumerary labourers. English mechanics, and workmen are not *unwilling* to change their place of residence, or to settle in foreign lands, if their doing so will better their condition;—will give them better wages for their labour. Nor are English capitalists at all unwilling to invest their capital in any speculation which holds out a probable hope of great profit.

What, then, is the reason of the undoubted but ano-

malous fact, that English capital and labour are *not* employed as they ought to be in our colonies? I think the fact may be very easily accounted for, and I must crave your attention whilst I endeavour to explain it. You may remember, that in speaking of the Phœnician and Grecian colonies, I laid particular emphasis on the fact, that those colonies always *represented* the parent state; they were *copies* of the city which founded them. A Greek colony presented a perfect image of Greek civilization, Grecian art, religion, and social organization. Hence it often came to pass that a colony outstripped its mother city in all the attributes of a great community, within a very few years after its foundation. In fact, some of the most insignificant towns of Greece proper—Troëzene and Chalcis for instance—founded some of the most magnificent cities of the ancient European world. A Greek who left Corinth or Athens, to form part of a colony in Asia Minor, or Sicily, or Italy, changed merely his residence. His habits of life were not changed: he had the same society—the same government—the same religious ceremonies. He beheld the same sort of works of art—he frequented the same sort of theatres, spectacles, games, and palæstræ; he worshipped in the same sort of temples that he had been used to at home. He was still connected with his original country; the link which tied him to the dwelling-place of his forefathers was lengthened—not broken; he was bound to the land of his birth, but it was by the strong cord of affection, not by the irritating and galling chain of *subjection* and of *law*. He

sacrificed no feeling—lost no dignity—by becoming a colonist. He was as great a man in his new abode, probably a much greater than he would have been, had he remained at home. His ambition had full play: his genius was cultivated: his tastes gratified: and, in a word, the full power of the Greek—his social, intellectual, and physical nature—was as amply developed in a colonial, as it could have been in a parent state. This admirable and perfect organization of system was—next to the wonderful spirit of enterprize and activity which so remarkably characterized the Greek people—the main cause of the surprising prosperity of their colonies: Such was the Greek principle: and on *no other* can colonies flourish or answer their purpose.

Now, what has been *our* principle and system of colonization? As far as England has acted in the business of colonization, on any principle at all; as far as the fitful—capricious—inconsistent—experiments—shifts—and expedients, to which our government has from time to time resorted, can be dignified by the name of *system*, so far our system may be called the very opposite and reverse of all Greek principle—all common sense—and all regard to the welfare, honour, and stability of our empire. With respect to colonization by public and legislative authority, the ideas entertained by the English government have been *two*:—first, that colonies might do very well as holes into which you might shoot the rubbish of your supernumerary pauper population: and secondly, that colonies might do very well as a depôt for convicted felons.

This colonization of a country by a criminal population is one of the wickedest things ever done by our own or any other country. Talleyrand said shrewdly, but wickedly, of the murder of the Duc d'Enghien, that "It was worse than a crime—it was a blunder." I will not adopt the *immorality* of this veteran statesman's remark, in applying it to our scheme of forming a colony of felons; but I will say of this scheme, that it combines more insane stupidity, with more abominable wickedness, than any other act of which our nation has been guilty. It really is very little short of declaring war against the civilization and morality of mankind.

What must the moral habits of a people be, who are the immediate descendants and progeny of a nation of thieves, cut-throats, and villains of both sexes, and of every description? I confess I stand appalled when I reflect on the awful wickedness committed by our government in this matter. Equally pernicious, and scarcely less wicked, has been the method adopted of sending out pauper emigrants. These poor creatures—sent from their native homes unfriended—unaided—desolate—have in many cases perished from want and disease—have often suffered great hardships in their sea voyage—often been lost in consequence of being embarked in vessels that were not sea-worthy. They have often contracted, and with fearful rapidity and violence propagated contagious disease, on their passage; they have died without the common offices of humanity, for there has been no clergyman on board to

cheer and console the spirit in its mortal agony: and disease of *any* sort was certain to become excessive and malignant—very often fatal—because there was no medical man on board to attend to the sick; and even of those vessels which *had* a surgeon, many often enjoyed but a doubtful advantage; for the surgeon was of such a description, that—not merely for his want of medical skill—but for other, and even graver reasons, it would have been better to have left him behind.

What has been the consequence of all this? why, that emigration to a colony has come to be regarded in the minds of a vast majority of people, as the penalty of beggary, or the punishment of crime. Sometimes private and voluntary companies have been formed for trading and commercial purposes, and they have occupied districts of our dependencies, as colonists. But their history has almost uniformly presented a series of disputes, misunderstandings, and quarrels, with the Colonial Office in Downing Street. This is not to be wondered at; for the Colonial Office is absolutely unfit for the management of the local affairs, and all the internal interests of distant colonies. How *should* a man—or batch of men—in London, know how to regulate the internal affairs of Australia or New Zealand? Within the last twenty years there have been thirteen different chief Secretaries of the colonies; and each of these chief Secretaries has had his own notions about colonial government. All of them were men of undoubted ability and character: but how can forty-five colonies be governed by an Office, the heads of which

are changed, on an average, once in every eighteen months? It is impossible that there should be any *stability* of system, any settled policy—much less any wise, vigorous, or statesman-like policy—in such a state of things. However good our colonial system might be, it would still be useless, as long as the Colonial Office at home retained the power, which it has at present, of vexatiously meddling with, overriding, and embroiling the colonies themselves.

But some one may say, “It is all very easy to object and find fault; perhaps, however, there is more difficulty in the matter than you imagine: have you any thing better of your own to produce?” I must admit it looks like conceit in any one, to suppose that he can do better than others have done; and although I can hardly fancy that any system could be deemed *worse* than our present method of managing our colonies, yet I should be unwilling to incur the charge of presumption, by putting forth any different plan of my own, supposing I had one. But the case is this—various methods have been adopted by various nations, for planting and governing colonies; and of these various methods, I believe ours to be the worst.

If an Englishman goes to a colony, he finds himself placed in a totally strange and novel state of society: he recognizes nothing: he is uneasy and discontented: none of his tastes are gratified: his eye and his heart miss in all directions the things he loved best: he never knew how *well* he loved them, till he had lost them. There is no squire’s house, or parish church;

no resident clergyman to whom he feels he has a right to apply for advice in matters of business, for charity in distress, or for consolation in sickness. Even his amusements do not seem the same to him, because he no longer enjoys them in the same society that he was accustomed to at home. His heart's most eager yearnings—his warmest affections—the cravings of his moral nature—are not provided for or satisfied: in transplanting the tree, no forethought has been taken to carry away some of the natural soil about its roots.

Such are the feelings which must affect our colonists, even those of the lowest grade of life; and people in the higher walks not only share these feelings, but entertain them in a superior degree, proportioned to their higher civilization and acuter sensibilities. In any sound system of colonization, all this must be altered. You cannot expect Englishmen to thrive and develop their full energies, unless you place them in circumstances congenial to their feelings, and accordant and harmonious with their previous habits; any more than you can expect a tree to thrive when transplanted, if it be placed in a totally different soil and climate, from that in which it originally grew. An English colonist *ought* to be reminded that he is separated from his native home, by nothing but the sea. If a colony is to be sent out worthy of the English name, and fit to represent the dignity and majesty of the English empire, some person of the highest station and rank—if possible, a prince of the blood—should lead it. The Spanish kings—the proudest of monarchs

—acted wisely so far, that they sent members of the royal family to govern their colonies. This leader should go, accompanied by a body of noblemen, the future members of a colonial house of peers; and there can be no doubt that if a prince of the blood were to signify his willingness to lead such an undertaking, plenty of noblemen would be found willing to accompany him. Many noblemen, whose importance is obscured and lost in the crowd of nobility at home, would gladly avail themselves of the opportunity of increasing their personal dignity and influence, with the hope of founding a powerful family—possibly a dynasty—in a remote colony. Many a noble would be willing to apply to himself the remark which James I. made to a peer, who—His Majesty thought—was too often in London—“My Lord,” said he, “when you are up in London here, you are like a ship in a large fleet out at sea—nobody takes much notice of you—you are overlooked in the crowd; but when you are down in the country, residing on your estate, you are like a ship in a river; you occupy the whole space.” And this desire to “occupy the whole space” will always act with the greatest force on the most generous and enterprising dispositions.

Thus, as soon as the business of colonization was made—as it ought to be—*honourable*, as well as probably lucrative, you would find abundance of men and women, of the highest education and rank, willing to embark in it. Men of *all* ranks in England are sufficiently embarrassed to know how to provide for the

younger branches of their families : let the colonies hold out the lure of honourable distinction, and plenty of men will greedily catch at it. But English noblemen and gentlemen will not dream of providing for children in a method, or by means, on which the world looks down as discreditable, or derogatory to the dignity of a man of honourable ambition. A colony ought to hold out to men of ability, wealth, and character, every inducement to embark in it, by having the power of conferring the highest rewards and distinctions on meritorious industry and superior genius. An Englishman ought not to feel himself debarred from any honour, or any dignity, however exalted, because he is a colonist.

There should be a colonial peerage and baronetage. The church and the law should be truly and adequately represented. Every profession, every art, and every trade, should have as much encouragement and as splendid reward offered to it, as it has in England. Do all this : and *then* you will make a fair trial of what an English colony can do. *Then* you will be able to estimate the real worth of English energy, ability, and perseverance. But do not dignify a few ship-loads of starved paupers, ruined mechanics, insolvent farmers, or condemned felons, with the title and attributes of an English colony.

Such a system of colonial government as I have sketched, should not be under the control of a Colonial Office ; it should be allowed to manage its own internal and local affairs. The head and ruler of such a colony

should not be removeable according to the whim and caprice of every fresh ministry at home. He should represent something of the *stability* and authority of the British crown: answerable for the proper and righteous fulfilment of his high trust to the highest tribunal, whether of the colony or the mother country; but placed *above* the jobbing cabals, and out of the reach of the capricious malice of party.

But here, I am aware, I may be met by the objection—I may be told that such a system as I propose would very soon lead to the independence of the colony. I believe, on the contrary, that our present system of perpetual squabbling with our colonies, our mismanagement, and irritation, will produce that result much sooner. And I believe all jealousy or fear of disaffection on the part of the colonies, *on such a ground*, to be most unauthorized and unfounded. The colonies in general cherish a deep feeling of loyalty towards England: they feel a pride and glory in belonging to the mighty and magnificent fabric of the British empire. This feeling is far more likely to be increased than diminished, in consequence of their being treated more liberally and generously—more in the spirit of equals and fellow-countrymen—than they are at present. Let us take warning from the Spanish colonies: they were governed on the centralization system; that is, they were entirely governed by the supreme authority at home. This ended, as we know, in the revolt and loss of the colonies to Spain; and in the remarkable fact, also, that all these colonies became, and still remain *republican*. Had the Spanish colonies been permitted

to control their own municipal and local affairs, they might have owned the sovereignty of Spain at this hour, and might have done much towards maintaining something of the ancient consideration and dignity of that splendid, but feeble and degraded power.

If our colonies are destined to fall away from us, surely it is wise to give them a monarchical rather than a plebeian shape. Turn your attention for a moment, to the United States of America. "Let any thoughtful observer consider the traits of character that distinguish these children of our fathers from Englishmen of the present day: and the probable causes of the difference. We are apt enough indeed, to ridicule as foibles, or to censure as faults, their national peculiarities; their deviations from our habits. But it would be wiser and worthier of us to trace them to their causes, and to add the result of our enquiry to our stock of legislative experience. We sent them forth poor, and struggling for subsistence; ought we to taunt them with becoming a money-making, and trafficking people? We severed the humble from the nobles of our land, and formed the embryo of a plebeian nation; ought we to find fault with their extravagant abhorrence of rank, or their want of high breeding and blood, which we so sparingly bestowed on them? We gave for the new community only *some* of the ingredients that enter into our own; can we wonder at the want of resemblance, and of congenial feeling, which has been the result?"*

* Hinds on Colonization; quoted by Wakefield.

feeling would have been obviated—how much would our harmonious intercourse with America have been advanced—how much smoother would our relations with the United States be at this moment—if our American colonies had been founded and governed on sound and judicious principles!

But some one may say, supposing a colony to be planted on the *best* system, what is to be the advantage of it? Supposing such a colony to be established in some of the districts bordering on the Cape of Good Hope, or in Australia, or Borneo—an island whose geographical position and relation to India and Australia, renders its possession of immense importance to England;—what advantages do you propose to gain? and *how* do you propose to gain them? I answer—that by the creation of fresh colonies, or by improving and enriching those you already possess, you in fact create an almost boundless field where your excessive capital and labour may be most profitably employed; and you at the same time open up new, various, and extensive markets for your manufactures. These advantages I would certainly *not* try to secure by any restraints on trade, or any jealous prohibition of foreign commerce: for if *these* modes of securing your colonial markets are adopted, you will infallibly lay the foundation of future misunderstanding and quarrel; and the probable foundation of premature and unnatural separation. In all British colonies, you are certain of a preference; because in fact, you are dealing with your friends—men of the like language, habits, tastes,

and feelings with yourselves ; men of the same blood ; you might almost call them of the same *firm*. These circumstances and considerations will always give you a preference over the foreigner, in your colonial markets. But it must be a preference arising from affection—not compulsion : as surely as you *restrict* the trade of your colony, you sow the seeds of disagreement and disaffection. A colony wisely governed and generously treated, would never be expensive to the mother country. Your colonies at present cost you vast sums of money, because you mis-govern them : because you treat them as inferiors—in a spirit of jealousy and fear. Were an English colony governed as it *ought* to be, it would have no more reason to complain, and would require no more compulsion to enforce its obedience to law, than an English county requires.

I have said that your commercial and trading profits would be immense, if colonization were promoted on the principles of an enlarged and enlightened policy. Yet the mere money profit would be the lowest and most insignificant part of the advantage. It is through her colonies that England exerts her present influence in the civilized world. And by a vigorous development and extension of a sound colonial system, she may increase her influence to an almost infinite and unassignable limit. Strip her of her colonies, and she sinks at once to the level of a third or fourth rate power. If her colonies be not *for* her, they will be *against* her. Between retaining Canada, and seeing that noble and magnificent country add its vast resources to the power

of the American United States, there is no alternative. You may abandon Australia, or the Cape of Good Hope; and no doubt the French will be glad enough to take them off your hands. Russia would be very willing to make the experiment of colonizing New Zealand. If you give these colonies up, foreign nations will believe that you abandon them because you are not strong enough to retain them. The belief in your power would be shaken: and opinion is power. You constitute so vast an empire, that you cannot waive a just pretension, or resign a possession, without imminent danger. What was the most immediate consequence of the declaration of independence by our North American colonies? why, that France and Spain declared war upon us; and the siege of Gibraltar was amongst the first fruits of our follies across the Atlantic. And so it would be again: and the first result—possibly the first notice—of our loss of Australia, might be the appearance of a French fleet off Plymouth. It would be impossible for England—even if she were insane enough to wish it—to give up her colonies, *with safety*. If she did so she would soon have to fight, not to maintain her mastery of the ocean, nor her supremacy over vast Asiatic continents, but for the preservation of her own independence at home. For the truth is, the glory and extent of an empire are real and solid advantages to all its inhabitants, and especially those who inhabit its centre. Foreign powers are deterred from attacking a nation which is defended by the prestige of greatness and empire. “Whatever

the possession of our colonies may cost us in money,"—even as they are now—"the possession is worth more in money than its money cost, and infinitely more in other respects. For by over-awing foreign nations, and impressing mankind with a prestige of our might, it enables us to keep the peace of the world—which we have no interest in disturbing—as it would enable us to disturb the world, if we pleased. The advantage is that the possession of this immense empire by England, causes the mere name of England to be a real and mighty power; the greatest power that now exists in the world." *Wakefield*, p. 98.

I wish—as every Englishman must—for the greatest extension of English power. But I wish not to extend that power by conquest and the sword: if possible, I would not have a single stone of the vast and majestic fabric of the British empire cemented by the blood of one single human being! I wish for the peaceful triumphs and conquests of colonization. I wish for the glory of England, because I know that wherever the genius of her people has full freedom of action, there liberty, and morality, and law will flourish. Above all, whithersoever her language and literature are conveyed, thither will be conveyed religious freedom and religious truth: so that wherever the flag of England waves, there shall also be raised the banner of the Cross; and the aggrandizement of our colonial empire shall be the token and pledge of the spiritual regeneration of mankind.