

primarily for the purpose of keeping the gate of Central Africa open to the Cape, the Cape was bound in honour to assume the expense and burden of the new colony as soon as possible. His view was, that when the Imperial Government was relieved of its charge, it might consistently with its own duty to the Empire go a step further, and devote the sum granted by the Treasury at home, to the object of turning the present protectorate into a crown colony, and so prepare the way for the Cape to come again up behind its heels and absorb the tract, at the proper time, into the administrative system of our South African colonies. In all this no belittling of the Empire can be observed—only a definite distinction drawn between Imperial and local functions of government. The Empire alone can enlarge its borders and admit new districts to the protection of its flag. Questions of police and administration are best determined, and the expense of them most rightly borne, by the governments in the immediate neighbourhood of the localities that they affect.

It was from the Cape that Sir Hercules looked for opposition to this view, and from the Cape that first it came. The Ministers of Cape Colony did not want to saddle themselves with the expense of the new administration. That it fell or did not fall within their proper local functions was of small consequence; it was being done for them free of expense, and they preferred the arrangement. From the point of view of the local treasury official it was natural that they should. The Colonial Office at home shared the opinions of Sir Hercules Robinson, but all representations to the colony fell on deaf ears till last year, when circumstances conspired to change the situation. Among these circumstances, the only one that need now be noticed is a very important shifting of the balance of influences in Colonial public opinion. The political public of the Cape is divided into three parties. There is the Afrikaner Bond, there are the Ministerialists, and the Opposition. The Afrikaner Bond is not necessarily composed of Dutch people, but it represents the current of Dutch sympathy at the Cape. Until quite lately it entertained the warmest feelings of brotherhood with the Transvaal, during the war it sent substantial help to the Boers, and it held as a doctrine that the development of Cape Colony was to be looked for through republicanism and ultimate union with the Transvaal and Orange Free State. But since the discovery and the unprecedented development of Johannesburg, the Transvaal is not what it used to be in the days of adversity. It has become puffed in its own conceit. It rejects the advice and guidance of its brothers in Cape Colony. So bigoted is it in its own opinions, that not only does it insist on five years' residence within its frontier before it will grant the franchise to miners from the Cape, who are practically making all its wealth, but in its official service it will employ only Dutchmen from Holland. A Dutchman from the Cape—the brother Afrikaner who for so long has maintained his fidelity to the Dutch centre in South Africa—is supposed to be tainted with English sympathies, and though he live in the Transvaal for ever, he is for ever incapacitated from taking any share in its administration. Protective duties in the Transvaal are enormous. Monopolies of manufacture are granted for almost every article of human use, proposals for railway expansion are rejected, and the young republic, inflated by its sudden wealth has, by a policy which seems from the point of view of its own advantage suicidal enough, resolutely broken all family ties outside its borders. Under these circumstances the Dutch of Cape Colony have been thrown back upon their English connections. Instead of looking for development through republicanism, they have been forced to look for development through Imperialism. As soon as they set their faces in this direction, the Imperial Government became worth conciliating. Renewed proposals on the part of Sir Hercules Robinson that the Bechuanaland colony should be taken over were considered more favourably. The Colonial Prime Minister, Sir Gordon Sprigg, thought that he might venture to propose it with some hope of acceptance, and in October last he made a tentative speech at East London with a view to feeling the pulse of his own public. Immediately the South African Committee party in England, true to its profession that Imperial and Colonial interests cannot coincide, and ready therefore to believe that what the Colony desired the Empire should oppose, set itself to rouse public opinion, and brought such pressure to bear upon Downing Street that the hands of the clock flew round, and a scheme which had been originally urged upon the Colony was hastily declared by telegraph to be outside the possibility of consideration. Naturally the Colony was indignant, indignant with Downing Street vacillation and indignant with an English public which deemed it unfit to be trusted with the direction of its own simple interests. The slap which republicanism had received on the left cheek was now balanced by a blow to Imperialism upon the right. The Colony was still standing stunned and smarting between the two when Sir Hercules made his great speech.

His part in South Africa has been from first to last that of a peacemaker. He found the Colony, eight years ago, in a state of almost universal war. He left it with peace on all its borders. He found the Dutch and English populations in the sharpest antagonism. He left them welded into one people. This is not a figure of speech, for it will be remembered that in all the late questions of general policy which have arisen, the Cape Parliament, where the Dutch party numbers thirty-four and the British party thirty-nine, has passed its resolutions without a dissentient vote. It is not therefore surprising that in his last utterance in the Colony Sir Hercules should have

made a supreme effort of conciliation. Up to that time his function had been to make peace between dissonant elements of the same colony. His final task was nothing less than to reconcile the Colony with the Empire.

He endeavoured to explain to his hearers, the colonists, that the blow which had been dealt to them did not come from the Empire, but from the regrettable meddling of irresponsible and ill-informed persons in England, and to assure them that they were right to trust to Imperialism for their future. And then he clearly stated his own political creed. Not that of the South African Committee, but the exact opposite. He believes—and his object in speaking was evidently to communicate that faith to his audience—that Imperial and Colonial interests are one. Let any fair-minded person, with the recollection of the political situation to which Sir Hercules Robinson addressed himself in his mind, read the speech and see for himself what he finds in it. "As Governor of a self-governing colony," Sir Hercules Robinson said, "I have endeavoured to walk within the lines of the constitution; and, as her Majesty's High Commissioner for South Africa, I have, whilst striving to act with equal justice and consideration to the claims and sensibilities of all classes and races, endeavoured at the same time to establish on a broad and secure basis British authority as the paramount power in South Africa." He then describes that forward policy in Bechuanaland which illustrates his conception of the broad and secure basis on which British authority should rest, and continues, "The true British policy for South Africa seems to me to be what may be termed Colonialism through Imperialism; in other words, Colonial expansion through Imperial aid, the Home Government doing what the Colonies cannot do for themselves, having constitutionally no authority beyond their borders." After this follows the statement which raised such a storm in England, but which, read with the context both of events and words, is surely much to the point, to the effect that he saw no permanent place in the future of South Africa for direct Downing Street rule. The Colonists to whom he spoke were intimately acquainted with all the facts of Downing Street blunders which I have briefly summarised in the early part of this article. They knew that Downing Street does not mean anything but English public opinion. They believed, and they had good reason for believing, that English public opinion, however respectable in itself, was not the opinion by which their public affairs should be guided; they were all sore at the moment from the late proof that their destinies as a people were being determined by the will of an irresponsible body of ill-informed individuals six thousand miles away, who could never by any possibility be called on to bear the consequences of their mistaken judgment. Was it not necessary that the man who united in his own person the double office of their Governor and Imperial High Commissioner should say to them, "Bear with this mismanagement for the present. There is no permanent place for it in the future of South Africa"? It was his conviction, his conviction as an Imperialist, and he expressed it, not knowing apparently how different was his conception of Imperialism from that of some parties at home. That this was so is shown by the definition he gives later on of the attempt to separate Colonial and Imperial interests, to disunite the offices of High Commissioner and Governor, and to set up a dependency in the interior, which should be governed directly from Downing Street and have no political relation to the Cape. He does not regard this kind of thing as Imperialism at all, but as idle and useless amateur meddling. Here is the paragraph. He has been speaking of Colonialism and Republicanism as the only permanently competing influences in the Cape Colony. "Whether these will always retain, as at present, their separate organisms, or whether one will, like Aaron's rod, absorb the other, is a problem which I will not attempt to solve; but I venture to think that British Colonialism is very heavily handicapped in the race by the well-meant but mistaken interference of irresponsible and ill-informed persons in England. The tendency of such amateur meddling, to my mind, is injurious in the long run to the natives; whilst it makes every resident in the Republics, English as well as Dutch, rejoice in their independence, and converts many a colonist from an Imperialist into a Republican."

The peculiar position of Sir Hercules as Imperial Commissioner and Colonial Governor gave such words coming from him a special effect. They did what he intended that they should do. They pacified the colony. They gave also an opportunity to the Home Government, which had it heartily seized, the bonds of the Empire would have been drawn close, in a manner to defy all Republican loosening. Had the Imperial Government said openly to the Cape Colony, "Yes, the High Commissioner is right. This is our conception also of the Imperial function. We believe with him that your interests and ours coincide, and we repudiate the outside meddling, which represents only a small portion of the nation's voice!" Had it made good its words by sending back Sir Hercules with full powers and assurances of support, how different would our position be at this moment in the eyes of all our Colonies. But no! While it listened with one ear to the Cape and murmured in response to what it heard that Sir Hercules was right, and that it had no desire to alter in any respect his very successful policy, it turned the other ear to the South African Committee and suggested diplomatic compromise of a kind which seems to the ordinary mind to presuppose every member of the Committee to be—with all respect—a fool. "We can't exactly change our policy and smash

up our Colonial interests to please you," so the agreement appears to have run, "but we can do this. We will pretend that we don't agree with the other party, and we will send another man instead of Sir Hercules Robinson. He shall carry out Sir Hercules Robinson's policy, so the country will not suffer, you will be pleased, and all be well?" Is it dignified? Is it worthy of the soul which slumbers in that great body, the people, that our Colonial policy should be conducted on such lines as this?

And the upshot of it all? The upshot of it all is that we have been made to think, that we have been made to ask ourselves, each by his own hearth, what is our conception of the Empire, and that we are dividing ourselves into Imperialists who include, and Centralists who exclude, Colonial interests from the future scheme of Greater Britain. Which of us is right is a question to which the future only can reply. But those of us who include the colonies in our scheme of things have little doubt that if the Empire is to take the place we hope for, it must cultivate a larger trust both in itself and them. We venture to think that it should hand over to them frankly the management of their own local concerns, and that such direction, interference, and assistance as they receive from London should be in connection with questions of essentially Imperial importance.

Shall there, then, be no place for the public? Shall the man in the street just waking to interest in the Colonies have nothing to say to them for the future? By no means. In the first place Imperial questions are precisely those on which it is worth the while of the Leviathan to arouse himself. They present broad issues which it is possible for him to judge; they affect him, and they are his concern. In the second place, there is still another method by which the public can take part in building the Colonial Empire. The chartered company, which has done such good service in the past, has good service still to do. It combines responsibility with the will and the energy to interfere. If the South African Committee would form itself into a chartered company for the administration and development of the Bechuanaland Protectorate, the feeling of Cape Colonists towards the Committee would undergo a rapid change, and Sir Hercules Robinson would probably be one of the first to back its endeavours. As a chartered company there would be no fear of its stirring up war with the Transvaal, for it would have to bear the consequences of war. As a chartered company it would not encourage native rebellion, for upon it would fall the responsibility of restoring order. It is not against the intervention of the public as such, but only against irresponsible intervention that Sir Hercules Robinson, and with him our principal colonies, have uttered their protest. May we not take it that the facts and the protest point alike to one solution, namely, that so long as Downing Street fills the position of the indicator of British public opinion it should take immediate direction only of affairs of British public concern. While it remains as it is now, responsible for both Imperial and local matters throughout our dominions, it is unable to attend fitly to either.—*Flora L. Shaw in Fortnightly Review.*

MONTREAL LETTER.

THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD.

ON Wednesday the eleventh inst., the triennial meeting of the Provincial Synod of the Episcopal Church in Canada was opened. The clergy, headed by the bishops, made a procession from the Synod Hall to St. George's Church, where they were met by surpliced choristers, and received by a large congregation of the faithful with due respect. Holy Communion was dispensed, and the Rev. Dr. Courtney delivered an inaugural sermon. The reverend gentleman preached from Acts xv. 6, "The apostles and elders came together to consider this matter," and while deploring the fact that the Church is surrounded on the one side by Romanism and on the other by organized Dissent, drew comfort from the hope that, although the Church had refused to recognize other churches and organizations either in Europe or elsewhere, there remained a possibility that the Church of Rome might possess sufficient of what the reverend gentleman was pleased to call "the grace of God" to justify the expectation that a sprinkling of its clergy and members might eventually arrive at the holiness of life which is the pre-eminent and universal characteristic of the Episcopal Church in Canada; and that the four large bodies of *non-conformists*, for *dissenters* is a harsh name, had not so far forfeited what the reverend gentleman was again pleased to call the "grace of God" as not to be instrumental in winning some souls to Christ. This schism of the Church was an evil, but it was permitted of God. These rival organizations, alas, claimed the title of the Church of Christ. They are forms of Protestantism. While no undue haste may be anticipated in the realization of the re-unity of the Church, the Church should still be a centre of unity, not only to these forms of Protestantism but also to the Church of Rome herself.

After the apostles and elders had considered these matters, they made an adjournment to the school-room, where the clerical and lay rolls were called, and the two Houses separated for business. The means adopted at present, with more or less implied sanction of the Church, to raise moneys for Christian work, received a merited and severe criticism. A motion to consolidate the various Synods of the Church, in order that an authoritative voice on this and other matters might be secured, induced a discussion resulting in the appointment of a committee