

In fine, we are brought to this point. Our great colonies are now *dependencies* only in name—they are in reality independent attachments, the bonds of union being very indefinite and variable. Now the whole of the difficulties and evils on which I have animadverted arise out of a policy directed to the notion of *dependency*, when the reality of it is wanting. In fact, our Colonial Minister is asked to carry out simultaneously two antagonistic lines of action. You have a startling example of this in the case of the Washington Treaty, when the Home Ministry exercised on the one hand, the prerogative of the Crown, on the other, by express terms in an Imperial treaty, reserved to the Canadian *dependency* the right of repudiating some of its provisions—a position easy to criticise, which is manifestly before all the world a ridiculous one, but which, after the declarations and concessions of successive ministries of both parties, was evidently the only alternative to a rupture. This is the British Empire.* *Stat nominis umbra!* My definition of a clever man is, one who always has his eyes and nose and mouth and ears and hands and feet and brains about him; and a great State, to be a living State, as clearly needs the perpetual and sympathetic activity of all its functions. But what are we to say of a State whose extremities, instead of being coherent, vital members, cling to the trunk only by flaccid and rotting integuments?

But the point I am extremely anxious to make this evening is, that the whole of the arguments of anti-Colonial writers have been directed against *dependencies*. It was of the relation of dependencies that Adam Smith first protested the weakness; it was of *dependencies* that Sir George Cornwall Lewis summed up the disadvantages; and it was against the evils of *dependencies*—actual or theoretical—that Professor Goldwin Smith wielded a Quixotic pen; but against inceptive states, territories, or colonies united to us by ties such as are easily conceivable, such as we have examples of, on principles determined by wisdom and mutual interest, their arguments are inapplicable. No argument has hitherto been adduced to prove that any Colonial adjunct of the Empire, brought on equitable conditions to form a homogeneous part of it, will not add to its strength, prosperity, and glory, or will not, as a consequence, enhance its own prospects and position. The basis of such an arrangement must be laid in principles, some of which are unknown to our existing relations—

* This is the felicitous conjunction of which the *Daily News* and the *Pall Mall Gazette* so calmly assure us!