

as such by the Rt. Hon. W. E. Forster in a contribution to the *Nineteenth Century* for February. Mr. Forster presided at the first meeting held in London when the resolution was proposed that federation was necessary to prevent disintegration. It is of course out of our power to do more than indicate the views of Mr. Forster. That gentleman declares the object to be "an organization for common defence and a joint foreign policy." He thinks that the colonies should be reminded that "it is not just that we at home should bear more than our fair share of the cost of protecting them from invasion." Again, "Let us only keep in mind what we want, viz., an organization for common defence and an official acknowledgment of the right of the colonies to have a voice in the determination of foreign policy." Referring to Sir John Macdonald's speech at the last Federation Conference Mr. Forster remarks: "The veteran Canadian Statesman hints courteously, but clearly, that our greatest colony would be opposed to a war of offence, but may be relied upon in a war of defence." He cites Sir John's own words: "He believed that the whole policy of Great Britain was opposed to aggressive war, and in any other war the people of Canada would be ready to take their share of the responsibility and the cost." The Premier of the Colony of Victoria has also given instructions to the Agent-General for that colony to support federation in a despatch which Mr. Forster has appended to his article. The Premier, Mr. Service, expresses his conviction that Mr. Goldwin Smith's notion of disintegrating the Empire by cutting off the colonies has little sympathy from Australasians, but he argues that colonial interests are sufficiently important to entitle the colonies "to some defined position in the Imperial economy." Mr. Service makes no reference to the question of sharing in the cost of defence, but admits that the colonies enjoy "the fullest measure of constitutional freedom." It is but a short time since the Premier of Great Britain, Mr. Gladstone, when defending himself from a charge of neglecting the colonies, stated, that when during the civil war in the United States the Canadians had made enquiries as to the prospect of their being defended he had himself, with two of his colleagues, to whom the matter had been referred, and with the concurrence of the late Lord Palmerston, reported that "it would be the duty of Great Britain to defend Canada against external aggression with the whole strength of the Empire."

We may refer very briefly to the views of Lord Dunraven, and of Mr. Stephen Bourne, who, it will be recollected, delivered a lecture in Montreal during the meeting of the British Association on the subject of federation. Lord Dunraven advocates a discriminating duty of 10 per cent on all foreign products and manufactures, in the faith that "the colonies would give us reciprocal favor in return." We feel perfectly assured that no British Parliament will ever again tax the food of the people, and we are equally certain that Canada would not venture to discriminate in favor of Great Britain and against the United States. There is far more apprehension of competition from the former than the latter. Mr. Bourne's views were clearly expressed in his lecture, and may be briefly stated. He was for free trade between Great Britain and her colonies, and non-intercourse with all foreigners who should refuse to adopt that policy. He was also for requiring the colonies to share the national expenditure for defence.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* contains a most interesting contribution from a nobleman who is eminently qualified to form a sound opinion on the new scheme. We refer to Lord Blachford who, as Sir Frederic Rogers, filled during many years, and during a most interesting period of colonial history, the office of permanent Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, on his retirement from which, on superannuation, he was raised to the peerage. It is the opinion of Lord Blachford that federation is "an unattainable phantom," and he has given his reasons for this opinion at considerable length. He cannot conceive the possibility of conducting a foreign policy with one foot in one place, and one in another. It was formerly found that the connection was endangered by the Mother Country claiming to interfere with the local affairs of the colonists. Could it not be endangered by allowing the colonists to interfere with imperial policy? In support of this view let us for a moment consider the effect of the colonies claiming the right to decide whether they ought to lend their aid in support of the Empire in a foreign war, and being guided in their action by their opinion as to whether it was an aggressive or a defensive war. The moral effect of a single refusal to aid the Mother Country on the ground that the war was aggressive, would more than counterbalance all the benefit that the Empire would gain by colonial aid.

Lord Blachford points out that the proposed council of assistance is to consist

of the High Commissioner for Canada and the Agents General of the other colonies, all these officers being servants not of the Queen of England, but of the Queen of Canada, Victoria, New South Wales, and the rest. As Queen of England she conducts its Government through ministers designated by the people of the United Kingdom, but she is also Queen of Canada, and a Governor appointed by her conducts the Government of the Dominion through the Ministers designated by the Canadians. By way of illustration Lord Blachford points out that the Colonial Commissioners might be instructed to ally themselves with the Irish national party, with the object of embarrassing the Imperial Government. It is urged that in nine cases out of ten the association would not be of the slightest use, while the questions with which the colonial office is concerned would only be confused by extraneous meddling. Then there would be the danger of log rolling, in illustration of which Lord Blachford suggests a case: "If you (Queensland) will help me (Newfoundland) to induce John Bull to risk a quarrel with France for the sake of my fisheries I will help you to induce him to risk a quarrel with Germany about the occupation of New Guinea."

We have, we trust, placed fairly before our readers the views of those in England who are engaged in the construction of a new form of political existence for the colonies of the Empire, and which certainly demands more attention from the Canadian public than has yet been given to it. As a practical illustration what is the character of the present war in Egypt? Is it aggressive or the reverse? If not, then the proposed regiments should be sent at the cost of Canada, an idea which does not seem to have been entertained by any one, although, if we can believe reports, New South Wales is to bear the cost of the military aid.

#### BILLS OF EXCHANGE.

Mr. Henry Smyth, of Chatham, Ont., has introduced a Bill to amend the law respecting Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, but it is hardly likely to commend itself to the judgment of the House. He seeks to make it unnecessary to give notice of protest (to the endorsers we presume, although the Bill does not say so), and in lieu provides that the holder of a bill or note shall give notice, which is to suffice for something, we presume to charge the endorsers, if any.