

markable measure (see pp. 37-8). "Jan Hofmeyr was only the first of modern Imperialists to warn the Empire that where a colony's treasure is, there would its heart be also".

While Mr. Currey has made no attempt to analyse the co-operation for which he stands, he is at great pains to analyse and dismiss as impossible any such plan of federation as Sir Joseph Ward's (made wholly, as we know, on his personal initiative): (1) Defence and foreign policy are bound up with commercial policy, which "*wages war peacefully on other nations*". (2) Minority representation would be intolerable to the Dominions. (3) A federal parliament would encroach upon Dominion autonomy; Australia would have to abandon her navy; the Dominions could not control their immigration, nor fix the conditions of labour on their mercantile marine; had the Laurier-Taft pact been carried, it would have been annulled. (4) It has always been regarded with more favour in the homeland, but even there it would be rejected: "Authority cannot be shared", Mr. Asquith reminds us. (5) Liberalism in the United Kingdom would never abandon free trade. (6) Finally, India and the dependencies could not be given proportionate representation and would therefore be "condemned to remain permanently under the rule of the Colonial and Indian Office".

In short, what Mr. Currey really advocates, in urging the development of the beginning we have made in the Imperial Conference, is an Imperial "co-operation" of equals *in which the Dominion co-operators have determined beforehand the plan of Imperial defence*. "The only policy which is consonant with the nationalist aspirations of these Dominions and may be calculated to allay their fears is one which supports the creation of Australian, New Zealand and Canadian Navies, growing as their Dominions grow and working with the units maintained by the Imperial government to safeguard their interests in the far east, for the common advantage of the Empire".