

moral and political influence, without care or cost, in proportion to the liberality of her conduct and to the sacrifices she has made. This party is reinforced, from time to time, by those who take a lower and more sordid view of the question—who think that Great Britain would hardly want an army or a navy, arsenals or dockyards, if she had no Colonies; who charge them with sums borne on the estimates, but never credit them with their consumption, or with the sacrifices they make to defend the interests and to uphold the dignity of the Empire. The parental relation is assumed to sanction this policy. Young men grow, and, when they are of age, marry and set up for themselves, and why should not colonies do the same? But the analogy is not perfect. One house would not hold all the married members of a large family, nor one estate maintain them. They scatter that they may live. They are kept in friendship by the domestic affections, and personal ties, which in respect of distant communities, do not exist, and at the death of the founder of the family there is an estate to divide.

Not so with Colonies. Their life begins at a distance from the homestead. There are few personal attachments. There is no estate to divide, and no security that when they separate they may not drift into antagonism to each other, and to the parent country. The policy then of rearing them, with the thought of separation ever in their minds,