LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM NICOL, CLEVELAND-ROW, ST. JAMES'S.

John Aulojo

ENGLAND

AND

AMERICA.

A COMPARISON OF THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL STATE OF BOTH NATIONS.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
RICHARD BENTLEY, NEW BURLINGTON STREET.

1833.

PRINTED BY W. NICOL, CLEVELAND-ROW, ST. JAMES'S.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

APPENDIX.

NOTE X.

ORIGIN, PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS OF SLAVERY IN AMERICA.

Declamation against slavery — history of the origin and progress of slavery in America— cause of slavery—prospects of slavery in the British West Indies—in the United States— possible means of abolishing slavery in the United States without a servile war.

"THE existence of slavery," says Mr. Stuart,* "in its most hideous form, in a country of absolute freedom in most respects, is one of those *extraordinary anomalies for which it is impossible to account.*"

The writer of the declaration of American independence has also written—"What an incomprehensible machine is man! who can endure toil, famine, stripes, imprisonment, and death itself, in vindication of his own liberty, and the next moment be deaf to all those motives whose power supported him through his trial, and inflict on his fellow men a bondage, one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that which he rose in rebellion to oppose. But we must

* Vol. ii. page 113.

wait with patience the workings of an overruling Providence, and hope that that is preparing the deliverance of these our suffering brethren. When the measure of their tears shall be full—when their tears shall have involved heaven itself in darkness—doubtless a God of justice will awaken to their distress, and, by diffusing a light and liberality amongst their oppressors, or, at length, by his exterminating thunder, manifest his attention to things of this world, and that they are not left to the guidance of blind fatality."

"Every American," says an English writer,*—every American who loves his country should dedicate his whole life, and every faculty of his soul, to efface the foul blot of slavery from its character. If nations rank according to their wisdom and their virtue, what right has the American, a scourger and murderer of slaves, to compare himself with the least and lowest of the European nations, much more with this great and humane country where the greatest lord dare not lay a finger on the meanest peasant? What is freedom where all are not free? where the greatest of God's blessings is limited, with impious caprice, to the colour of the body? And these are the men who taunt the English with their corrupt parliament, with their buying and selling votes. Let the world

* Edinburgh Review, No. LXI. Art. "*Travellers in America,*" attributed to Mr. (now Lord) Brougham.

judge which is the most liable to censure—we, who in the midst of our rottenness, have torn off the manacles of slaves all over the world, or they, who, with their idle purity, and useless perfection, have remained mute and careless while groans echoed and whips clanked round the very walls of their spotless congress. We wish well to America—we rejoice in her prosperity—and are delighted to resist the absurd impertinence with which the character of her people is often treated in this country. But the existence of slavery in America is an atrocious crime, with which no measures can be kept—*for which her situation affords no sort of apology*—which makes liberty itself distrusted, and the boast of it disgusting."

These passages describe the feeling of Englishmen generally, and of not a few Americans, with respect to slavery in America. But when was any great evil cured by mere declamation? and what but mere declamation is there in these passages? Like other evils, slavery in America has its causes; and until these be removed the evil effect must continue. No Englishman, no American, as far as I know, has taken the trouble to ascertain the causes of slavery in America. Had this been done, it might perhaps appear, that *the situation of America does afford some sort of apology for the foul stain upon her character.* The causes of slavery in America will be found in a brief history of its origin and progress; and, these ascer-

tained, the prospects of slavery may be examined with some chance of a useful result.

The first European colony in America was planted by Spaniards in the island of St. Domingo, or, as it was originally called, Hispaniola. The first Spanish colonists of St. Domingo received from the Spanish crown extensive grants of the most fertile land. The settlers carried with them an abundance of capital, and each settler obtained more good land than he could possibly cultivate. But land and capital are not the only elements of production. In order to produce wealth the first colonists of St. Domingo wanted labourers. If some of them had laid out a portion of their capital in conveying labourers from Spain, the other settlers, who had not so expended a portion of their capital, would have been able to pay for the service of such labourers more than those could have paid, who had diminished their capital by conveying labourers from Spain. Those who had not so diminished their capital, offering higher wages than those who had, would have enjoyed what the former had expended capital to procure. This does actually occur very often in modern English colonies. Thus, unless all the settlers had agreed that each should take out a number of labourers in proportion to his capital, none of them could have had any motive for laying out capital in that way. Moreover, if such an agreement had been possible, and its execution

practicable, the labourers taken out by the capitalists, to a place where every one could obtain plenty of good land for a trifle, would have ceased to be labourers for hire; they would have become independent landowners, if not competitors with their former masters in the market of labour. This also does actually occur every day in several modern colonies. Consequently, the first Spanish settlers in St. Domingo did not obtain labourers from Spain. But, without labourers, their capital must have perished, or at least must soon have been diminished to that small amount which each individual could employ with his own hands. This has actually occurred in the last colony founded by Englishmen—the Swan River settlement—where a great mass of capital, of seeds, implements and cattle, has perished for want of labourers to use it, and where no settler has preserved much more capital than he can employ with his own hands. The first settlers in St. Domingo remaining without labourers, their only prospect was a solitary, wild, half-savage existence. Nay, they might have died for want. Of the colonies planted in modern times, more have perished than have prospered. Those settlers might have died of want, because their own labour, not being combined in any degree, but being cut up into fractions as numerous as the individuals, might not have produced enough to keep them alive. In the colonies of modern times,

thousands of people have died from this cause, and some in the last colony founded by England. Urged by this want of labourers, the first settlers in St. Domingo persuaded the Spanish government to include in each of its grants of land *a proportionate grant of natives*. The most ancient grants of land in Hispaniola mention the number of natives which each grantee was authorised to treat as cattle. This was the origin of slavery in America.

The colonists, by means of the supply of labour thus obtained, readily acquired wealth; for they could now employ many hands in the same work, at the same time, and for a long period of time without intermission. Other Spaniards, inflamed by the accounts which reached Spain of the success of the first colonists, hurried to St. Domingo, and, obtaining grants of natives as well as land, prospered like those who had gone before them. In the course of a few years, the prosperity of Hispaniola excited, as that of the United States does now, the envy and admiration of Europe. But the colonists, regardless of the fable, killed the goose for its golden eggs: they destroyed the feeble natives by over working them. The colony had hardly reached a very flourishing condition when the source of its prosperity was dried up. In this emergency, it occurred to the dejected settlers that the neighbouring islands were inhabited. To those islands some of them repaired and seized

the natives, whom they sold to the planters of St. Domingo. This was the first slave trade carried on in America.

But the discovery of a supply of labour, which seemed inexhaustible, was not calculated to teach the colonists either caution or humanity. As they had overworked and destroyed the natives of St. Domingo, so they worked to death the slaves whom they procured from other islands. It has been said that in religious and moral England, there are men who make a practice of buying an old or diseased horse for the value of its skin, and driving it without food till it dies; the motive assigned for such barbarity being the clear profit obtained by the use of an animal, which costs nothing for keep while in use, and yet sells, when dead, for as much as it cost alive. Somewhat in like manner, the planters of St. Domingo found it more profitable to work slaves to death, and replace them, than to preserve their existence by suiting their work to their strength. This wholesale murder of stolen Indians produced a feeling of indignation in Europe. Las Casas, the Clarkson or Wilberforce of his time, founded a sect of abolitionists; a party closely resembling in many points the European and American abolitionists of the present day. They spared no pains for the attainment of their object. By exciting the best feelings of human nature, by spreading throughout Europe detailed accounts of the

cruelties to which Spanish slaves were subject, by circulating tracts, by an extensive correspondence, by worming their way into courts and councils, by enlisting on their side the tender but powerful influence of women, by extraordinary watchfulness to seize every opportunity, and diligence in turning it to account, and still more by their unalterable constancy of purpose, they at length made an impression on the government of Spain. But although the King of Spain listened to the abolitionists, he was unwilling to ruin the planters: he consented to protect the Indians to the utmost extent, using modern language, that was compatible with the rights of property and the interests of the slave owners: in other words, he expressed compassion for the slaves, because this was required by public opinion, but he would do nothing for them. The question was in this state when the abolitionists themselves proposed, that the planters might spare the feeble natives of America by procuring hardy negro slaves from Africa. The suggestion was adopted, and found to answer its purpose. Red slavery was abolished, and black slavery established; and this was the beginning of a slave trade between Africa and America.

The first English settlers in America, obtained from queen Elizabeth a grant of land to the extent of two hundred miles in every direction from the spot on which they might establish themselves. They found a country which they

described as a paradise, and to which the queen, delighted with their account of it, gave the name of Virginia. Instead, however, of proceeding without delay to cultivate a very small part of the fertile territory at their disposal, they were tempted by its very extent to wander up and down upon it; until the capital which they had taken with them being consumed they were reduced to famine, and gladly seized an opportunity of returning to England. In the following year, another settlement was made under the same grant and on the same spot; but though on this occasion the settlers had an ample stock of seeds, implements and cattle, with provisions for two years, every one of them perished; by what means, indeed, can only be inferred, since the skeleton of one man was all that remained of this colony when a third body of emigrants from England reached the place of settlement. In two years this third body of emigrants had disappeared like the second. Thus, three attempts to take advantage of abundance of good land, "the sole cause," says Adam Smith, "of the prosperity of new colonies," entirely failed; attempts, too, directed by sir Walter Raleigh, a man eminently qualified to insure their success. Why those attempts failed, may be conjectured from what happened to the first body of English settlers in America that did not perish.

The first English colony in America that did

not perish, was planted in Chesapeake Bay under a grant from king James I., who bestowed good land upon the settlers, not by the acre or the mile, but by degrees of latitude, and without limit as to longitude. In this case, a few hundred persons, amply provided with capital, and, led, too, by men of experience and conduct, obtained more land of very great natural fertility than existed in the densely peopled country that they had abandoned. In the course of twenty years, they were joined by nearly as many thousand emigrants; yet at the end of that period the population of the colony was less than two thousand souls. This most uncommon decrease of people was occasioned by extreme misery. Of the first settlers, each was able to obtain as much good land as he desired to call his own. From this great abundance of good land, nothing being done to counteract it, there arose two evil consequences in particular. In the first place, nearly every one became independent of all the others, working by himself in solitude, and therefore dividing his labour amongst so many occupations, that he could bestow but little of his time on the production of food, while that small portion of his labour which was so employed produced but little, because scarce any operation of agriculture is very productive unless there be employed in it several pairs of hands in combination and constantly, in the same particular work, at the

same time and for a considerable period of time together. Secondly, as nearly every one took possession of a great deal more land than he could possibly cultivate, the greater part of what he possessed became, by becoming his, as a desert which surrounded him. No roads were made, because as nearly every settler did every thing for himself and by himself, that combination of power which is indispensable to the construction of a road was out of the case. Thus each settler was surrounded, not merely by a desert, but by a desert which was next to impassable. Further, much of the capital which had been taken out, such as cattle, seeds and implements, perished either on the beach or in the forest, because the owners of it could not preserve that well-regulated labour without which it is impossible that capital should be increased or even preserved. As every colonist was isolated, so all wanted both the means and the motive for raising any surplus produce; and any unfavourable accident, consequently, such as a wet harvest time or an incursion of the Indians, reduced many to want, cut off some by famine, and brought the colony to the verge of destruction. The records and traditions of Virginia leave no doubt, that the first inhabitants of that country suffered, during a long course of years, every conceivable hardship.

The colony was on the point of being abandoned, when five hundred emigrants, most of

them of the labouring class, arrived from England. He who is accustomed only to what takes place in densely peopled countries, may imagine that this influx of labourers into a society, whose only want was the want of labourers, must have produced the most happy results. But this was not the case: the evil cause existed still and produced the same evil effect. The great plenty of land led nearly all the newly arrived emigrants to become isolated settlers; there were more colonists for a time, but not one was in a better condition, or had a better prospect, in consequence of an increase of numbers. At length, the whole body of settlers, dispersed, and prevented from helping each other, were unable to raise enough food for their subsistence. Their bright hopes frustrated, general disappointment produced discontent, selfishness and a reckless disregard of all social ties. The founders of Virginia were not more remarkable for their great disasters than for their atrocious crimes. They are described as resembling hungry wild beasts; and if we must speak of them as human beings, it is not harsh to say, that they appeared to have crossed the Atlantic for the purpose of cutting each others throats without restraint from any law.

Such was the deplorable state of this colony when a circumstance occurred, which, though accidental and apparently trifling, has proved one of the most important events in the history

of America. A Dutch ship laden with slaves made its appearance in James's river. Want of provisions had induced the captain to put in there, and he was therefore ready to dispose of his living cargo for a trifle. These slaves were bought; and this was the beginning of slavery in the United States.

The slaves were set to work, some in raising food, some in cultivating tobacco. For the first time in this colony there was combination of labour and division of employments. Tobacco, although denounced by king James as a vile and nauseous weed, was already prized in Europe; and the soil and climate of Virginia were peculiarly suited to its growth. Those settlers, therefore, who by obtaining slaves were enabled to employ many hands constantly in one work, in preparing the ground for tobacco plants, in watering the plants, in preventing the growth of weeds, and in gathering, drying and packing, the leaves, now raised a commodity exchangeable in the markets of Europe. In this way, they obtained various supplies, which they could not have obtained in any other way. In this way also they found the means of purchasing more slaves. As the number of slaves increased, the cultivation of tobacco was extended; some roads were made and solid houses were built. In the course of a few years, the face of the colony was changed,

and the tobacco planters of Virginia became noted for their prosperity.

The frightful condition, both physical and moral, of the settlers, up to the time when they obtained slaves, was almost a bar to the emigration of women. It is supposed that the proportion of males to females, who emigrated to this colony during the first thirty years of its existence, was above twenty to one. While the colony was in a state of misery and disorganization, none of the settlers could have desired, nor could any of them have easily procured, wives to share their misfortunes. But when they had acquired the means of comfort and order, they naturally longed to be husbands and fathers. As that longing was created by the combined and constant labour of slaves, so was it gratified. The settlers offered to the captains of English ships two hundred and fifty pounds of prime tobacco for each young woman of pure health and good temper, whom the latter should bring from England, harmless, and bearing a certificate of honest manners from the clergyman of her parish. At that time, as at present, England abounded in young women, beautiful, gentle and virtuous, but without the least prospect of happiness in marriage. The English captains, therefore, easily fulfilled their commissions, and finally conducted a very extensive commerce in tobacco and marriageable girls.

From this curious traffic, which, considering the abundance of good land in Virginia, could not have taken place without slavery, sprung a large proportion of those illustrious Americans, who dared the first trial of perfect equality in government, amongst whites.

The prosperity of Virginia led to the establishment of more colonies, as well in the islands as on the main land of America. With the increase of white population in America, the number of American slaves increased, in some measure by breeding, but for the most part by importation from Africa. At length the horrors of the African slave trade raised up a new set of abolitionists. The value of slavery to the white men of America would be proved, if by nothing else, by the great and manifold obstacles which the abolitionists had to surmount before their object was even partially effected. Their purpose was to abolish slavery in America. With greater exertion and difficulty than attended the establishment of some wide-spread religions, they have accomplished no more than the abolition of a trade in slaves between Africa and a part of America.

Las Casas probably knew how slavery began in America. By his proposal to substitute black Africans for red Indians, he seems to have acknowledged the difficulty, he may even have perceived the impossibility, of combining the labour of freemen and raising a large net produce in

countries where every one may obtain more good land than he can possibly cultivate. But Las Casas had lived in America and witnessed the operation, first of abundance of good land, and next of slavery. The modern project of abolition was conceived by a youth in an English university; and, though Clarkson visited the West Indies, it was not till his feelings had been inflamed by contemplating from a distance the abominations of slavery. At all events, Clarkson and Wilberforce expected that the abolition of the African slave trade would put an end to slavery in America. Never was there a greater mistake.

The American and English slave trade with Africa was not abolished till the English in the West India islands and the Americans on the continent had procured an ample stock of slaves. Their property, neither in these nor in the progeny of these, was affected by the abolition of the trade with Africa. In order to keep up their stock of slaves, in order to increase that stock indefinitely, it was now required that, instead of resorting to Africa for fresh supplies, they should breed slaves at home. But in doing this, they found no difficulty. Thus, slavery in America, instead of being extinguished by the abolition of the African trade, was placed on a surer foundation than when it depended on that traffic.

It must be acknowledged, however, that the

abolition of the African trade has produced some mitigation of the evils of slavery in America. While that trade continued, it was often found more profitable to work slaves to death and replace them, than to preserve them by suiting their work to their strength. In order that they should not decrease, still more in order that they should increase, it became necessary to treat them with some consideration, with just so much consideration as a stock-farmer bestows upon his cattle. So far, the slaves of America owe to the abolitionists a decided improvement in their condition.

But this improvement has not extended over all British America. An important distinction must here be drawn between the islands and the main land; a distinction the more necessary because Englishmen generally suppose, that there is no great difference, if any, between the state of slavery in the United States and the state of slavery in the West Indies. The good land of the islands is of limited extent, while that of the continent has no assignable limits. The same piece of land will not produce sugar for many consecutive years without a great increase of expense; and nearly all the good land of the islands has been exhausted by the cultivation of sugar. Since that land was exhausted, the growers of sugar on the continent have had a great advantage over the same class of people in the

islands. So great has been the advantage, that assuredly, if the produce of the continent had been let into the markets of Europe on equal terms with the produce of the islands, the islanders would, some time ago, have ceased to produce sugar. In the British islands especially, it is obvious that the cultivation of sugar has been preserved by means of a monopoly of the British market. But as that monopoly was required by the exhaustion of the soil of the West Indies, so it encouraged the further exhaustion of that soil, till the profits of sugar growing in the West Indies were reduced to that amount which, with the monopoly, was just sufficient to prevent sugar-growing from being abandoned. Consequently, since the abolition of the African slave trade, the planters of the West Indies have not had a strong motive for increasing the number of their slaves. It was not the abolition of the African trade, but the exhaustion of all the good land at their disposal, which deprived them of this motive. Between those two events there is no connection, except parity of time. If the African slave trade had not been abolished, if it had continued to render unnecessary the preservation of slaves, still the greater profit of killing and replacing slaves would not have counteracted the loss of profit arising from the necessity of cultivating land, which every year decreased in fertility.

But, with a close monopoly of the finest market in the world, the planters of the British West Indies might for ages have continued to grow sugar with some profit, and might have retained a motive for keeping up the number of their slaves. If they had preserved a close monopoly of the British market, the people of Britain would, probably, have made up for the continued decrease in the fertility of insular land by continually paying a higher price for insular sugar. Though the produce would have been less and less, the profit might have remained the same, in consequence of the price becoming higher and higher. But "the West India interest" as the island planters are called, though they have long enjoyed very great influence in the legislature of Britain, were not permitted to flourish in this way at the expense of the British people. During the last war, the English took from the Dutch their continental settlements in America; and at the close of the war they determined to keep those colonies, making compensation to the Dutch by agreeing to pay a vast sum to the emperor of Russia, provided (such is the complication of European politics) the Belgians and the Dutch, who hated each other and had been united at the peace, should not choose to separate. The West India interest could easily have prevented this acquisition; but they were blind to its consequences. It broke up their monopoly of the British market. By

bringing continental sugar into competition with insular sugar, it prevented the island planters from raising the price of their sugar in proportion to the decrease in the fertility of their land. This acquisition was a mortal blow to the West India interest. Ever since it took place none of them have made large profits, many of them have been ruined, by the cultivation of sugar; and the total ruin of the whole of them, in so far as their West India property is concerned, seems inevitable. These circumstances have had a peculiar effect on insular slavery. What with the progressive exhaustion of insular land and the opening of the British market to sugar produced on land that was not exhausted, the island planters have, for some years past, been without a motive for keeping up the number of their slaves, while they have had the strongest motive for working them to death. The result is well known; a decrease of population such as if pestilence and famine had done the work.

Turning to the United States, we find that the abolition of the African slave trade has led to a striking improvement in the condition of slaves. The increase of white population in America did not increase the proportion of free labourers to capitalists, and did not therefore diminish the value of slaves. On the contrary, as every freeman could readily obtain land of his own, with that increase of whites, of freemen, persons

wanting labourers bore a greater proportion to labourers, and the demand for slaves increased accordingly. As every one, not being a slave, could obtain for a trifle more good land than he could possibly cultivate, all capitalists felt the want of combined labour. All those whites, consequently, who settled in the slave states became anxious to procure slaves. The African trade being abolished, those who wanted slaves could obtain them only from those Americans who already possessed them. This great demand for slaves, great in proportion to the increase of whites in the slave states, and to the increased demand in the other states for the produce of combined labour, led to the establishment of a new trade in America; the trade of breeding slaves for sale. The extent and importance of that trade may be estimated by reference to one or two facts. The black population of the slave states has increased much more rapidly than the white population of those states; and the slave population has increased at a somewhat greater rate than the free population of the whole Union. There are two millions of slaves, and if we reckon the average value of a slave at 60*l.*, the capital invested in slavery is 120,000,000*l.* Taking the yearly increase of slaves in the United States to be at least 60,000, and the average value of a slave to be 60*l.*, the produce in money obtained by the breeders of slaves, *merely for breeding*, is 3,600,000*l.*

per annum.* These statements will suffice, without further explanation, to show that the abolition of the African slave trade has worked a great improvement in the condition of American slaves.

But the abolition of the African slave trade would not have had this effect, if the original cause of slavery had not steadily continued to operate. Considering how slavery arose, and in what way it has progressed in America, its original and permanent cause seems to be *super*-abundance of land in proportion to people. Other considerations come to the support of this view of the subject.

That superabundance of land to which the English economists, from Adam Smith downwards, attribute the prosperity of new colonies, has never led to great prosperity without some kind of slavery. The states of New England, in which negro slavery was never permitted, form no exception to the general rule. Adam Smith, in his chapter on "the causes of the prosperity of new colonies," tries to establish by a pretty long argument that the wonderful prosperity of the Greek colonies was owing to "dearness of labour," to "high wages," which enabled the bulk of the people to save and to increase as rapidly as pos-

* 200*l.* and 300*l.* are common prices for a well taught and able slave. As much as 600*l.* is sometimes given for a young man of superior skill in some lines of industry. *See Stuart, vol. 2, page* 195.

sible: whereas the unquestionable fact is, that all the work performed in those colonies, whether in agriculture or manufactures, was performed by slaves. All work in Brazil has been performed by the labour of slaves. In New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, prosperous colonies, capitalists are supplied with slave-labour in the shape of convicts. That they set the greatest value on this labour, is proved by their extreme fear lest the system of transportation should be discontinued; although the evils which it produces are too many to be counted, and too great to be believed in England. Finally, though the puritans and the followers of Penn, who founded the colonies of New England, flourished with superabundance of land and without negro slaves, they did not flourish without slavery. Though their religious sentiments prompted them to abstain from the purchase of negroes, so severely did they, on that very account, feel the want of constant and combined labour, that they were led to carry on an extensive traffic in white men and children, who, kidnapped in Europe, were virtually sold to those fastidious colonists, and treated by them as slaves. But the number of Europeans kidnapped for the purpose of sale in those parts of America where negroes could not be sold, though considerable, in proportion to the number of settlers then wanting combined labour, was small when compared with the num-

ber of Europeans, who, first decoyed to America by the offer of a passage cost free, and the promise of high wages, were then transferred for terms of years to colonists who paid for their passage. These, under the name of *redemptioners*, were, for a long period, the principal servants of those colonies in which slavery was forbidden by law. Even so lately as within the last twenty years, and especially during the last war between England and America, which put a stop to Irish emigration, vast numbers of poor Germans were decoyed to those states which forbid slavery, and there sold for long terms of years to the highest bidder by public auction. Though white, and free in name, they were really not free to become independent landowners, and therefore it was possible to employ their labour constantly and in combination. Lastly, even in those colonies which never permitted negro slavery, negroes have always been considered, what indeed, there seems reason to conclude that they are by nature, an inferior order of beings. A black man never was, nor is he now, treated as a man by the white men of New England.* There, where the most com-

* "The freedmen of other countries have long since disappeared, having been amalgamated in the general mass. Here there can be no amalgamation. Our manumitted bondsmen have remained already to the third and fourth generation, a distinct, a degraded and a wretched race." *President Nott of Union College, New York*—quoted by Mr. Stuart.

plete equality subsists amongst white men, and every white man is taught to respect himself as well as other white men, black men are treated as if they were horses or dogs. Thus, notwithstanding superabundance of land, black men have always found it difficult to rise above the condition of labourers for hire; and thus such blacks as either escaped, or were allowed to go free, from the slave states, to settle in the other states, provided servants for the capitalists of those other states. The large proportion of black servants in New England has always been remarked, and it is remarkable at this moment in Philadelphia, the strong hold of quakerism.* In this way, the

"Few people of colour in the churches, and such of them as are there, *assemble in a corner separate from the rest of the people.*" Stuart, vol. 1, page 196.

* "It is computed that there are in Philadelphia 10,000 free coloured people." *Journal of Travels in the United States of North America and in Lower Canada, performed in the year 1817, by John Palmer.* The number of blacks in Philadelphia is very much greater than in 1817. By the last Census of the American people it appears, that in 1831, there were in the state of Pennsylvania 37,900 free coloured persons; in the state of New York 44,869; and in Ohio 37,930.

"The whole establishment (on board the 'North America' steam-boat, New York) of kitchen servants, waiters and cooks, all people of colour, on a great scale." *Stuart, vol. 1, page 40.*

"Nothing can be more disgraceful to the people of the United States, nor more inconsistent with their professed principles of equality, than their treatment of free people of colour.

slavery of some states has, not very indirectly, bestowed upon other states much of the good and some of the evil, that arise from slavery.

In another way, the states which forbid slavery have gained by it immensely without any corresponding evil. The states of America must be viewed as one country, in which there is a considerable distribution of employments, and in which exchanges take place of the different productions raised in different parts of the Union. "The division of labour," says Adam Smith, meaning the distribution of employments, "is limited by the extent of the market." The great fishing establishments of the non-slaveholding colonies were set up for the purpose of supplying the slaves of the West Indies, Maryland, Virginia, Georgia and the Carolinas, who were employed in raising tobacco, rice and sugar; commodities exchangeable in the markets of Europe; commodities which have never been raised on any large scale in America except by the combined labour of slaves. A great part of the commerce of the northern states, of Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, has always consisted of a carrying trade for the southern states; the one work of raising produce for the markets of Europe and conveying it thither being so divided, that the produce was

They constantly subject them to indignities of every kind, and refuse altogether to eat or drink with them." *Stuart, vol. 1, page 507.*

raised by the southern and conveyed by the northern states; a division of employments which depended on the labour of slaves, since, if a produce had not been raised fit for distant markets, carriers would not have been required, and since such produce could not* have been raised by labour, uncertain and scattered as free labour always is with superabundance of good land. At the present time, which is the great market for the surplus produce of farmers in the non-slave holding states on the western rivers? New Orleans; and how could that great market have existed without slavery?† Capitalists again,

* "The following is Mr. Timothy Flint's account of a Louisiana plantation. "If we could lay out of the question the intrinsic evils of the case (he had been alluding to the state of the slaves) it would be a cheering sight, that which is presented by a large Louisiana plantation—the fields are as level and regular within figures, as gardens. They sometimes contain 3 or 4000 acres in *one* field; and I have seen from a *dozen to twenty ploughs*, all making their straight furrows through a field, a mile in depth, with a regularity which, it would be supposed, could be obtained only by a line." This description is quite correct. The drills of the finest turnip fields in Norfolk, or even on Mr. Rennie's, of Phantassies, beautiful farm in East Lothian, are not more accurately drawn; nor is the whole management more admirable than the lines and the cultivation of the cane on one of the great plantations of Louisiana." *Stuart, vol. 2, page 215.*

† "He (Colonel Coleman) had come up the Appalachicola and Chattabooche rivers, and was now on his way to New Orleans to buy pork and provisions for his slaves. He has

natives of the states which forbid slavery, reside during part of every year in the slave states, and reap large profits by dealing in rice, sugar and cotton, exchangeable commodities, which, it must be repeated, have never been raised to any extent in America except by the labour of slaves. A New Englander may boast that slavery was never permitted in his state, as a baker may pride himself on being less cruel than his neighbour the butcher; but the dependence of the northern on the southern states for a market for their surplus produce, for a demand for the produce of their industry in a thousand shapes, is as close as the dependence on each other of the baker and the butcher who deal together. In the division of employments which has taken place in America, the far preferable share, truly, has fallen to the

only got forty slaves upon his property, but he tells me that twenty slaves are necessary for every 100 acres of sugar cane land." *Stuart, vol. 2, page* 155.

"One of our stopping places for wood not far above the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio, was at Mr. Brox's farm on the west side of the river. He has 700 acres of fine land, about 100 head of cattle, and an innumerable quantity of pigs. He says he has no difficulty in selling all the produce of his farm; he disposes of his stock *to the New Orleans butchers,* who go all over this country to make their purchases; and there are merchants who have great depôts of grain, salted pork and other agricultural produce, *which they scour the country to collect, and afterwards carry to New Orleans. Stuart, vol. 2, page* 302.

northern states; but that division of employments did not precede, on the contrary it followed, combination of labour in particular works and the surplus exchangeable produce obtained by that first improvement in the productive powers of industry. The states, therefore, which forbid slavery, having reaped the economical benefits of slavery, without incurring the chief of its moral evils, seem to be even more indebted to it than the slave states. If those who forbid slavery within their own legal jurisdiction, should also resolve to have no intercourse or concern with slave-owners, to do nothing for them, and to exchange nothing with them, we should see an economical revolution in America, that would prove better than a thousand arguments the value of slavery in a country where every free man can obtain plenty of good land for a trifle.

Let us now turn for a moment to those new countries in which the people have had superabundance of good land without slavery. Not a single one of these societies has greatly prospered: many have perished entirely, and some remain in a deplorable condition. From these last, two striking examples may be selected.

It would be unfair to dwell here on the misery, in conjunction with superabundance of good land, which belongs to many savage nations; but an allusion to such cases is not misplaced, if made only for the purpose of explaining that the

present enquiry is confined to the operation of superabundance of good land on civilized societies, amongst whom private property is established, who possess some knowledge of the productive arts, and who practice to some extent that division of classes and employments which, on the principle of mutual assistance, adds to the productive powers of industry. The most remarkable instance, perhaps, of such a society, having at its disposal an unlimited quantity of good land, is the Spanish colony of Buenos Ayres. The vast plain which lies between the South Atlantic and the mountains of Chili contains hardly any sterile land. Nearly the whole of it consists of the most fertile soil, which, though in a state of nature, exhibits vegetation more luxuriant than could be produced in the greater part of Europe by the most skilful cultivation. This land is naturally fit for cultivation; since throughout the pampas there are no dense forests like those which once covered Pennsylvania, nor any swamps like those which still remain on the shores of the gulph of Mexico. On a district extending one hundred and eighty miles from the coast, nature produces the richest crops of nothing but thistles and clover, and on another district, extending four hundred and fifty miles further to the west, nothing but a profusion of grass without a weed. The climate of the whole plain resembles that of Italy with this difference in its favour,

that it is not rendered unwholesome by malaria. This, then, was the finest situation in the world, in which to take advantage of abundance of good land. The Spaniards, who got possession of these fertile plains, emigrated from one of the civilized European states. Yet, according to the best information that can be obtained of a society now more than half barbarous, this colony never prospered. Capital has never obtained high profits, nor labour high wages. On the contrary, the colony seems to have languished throughout its career, and though the people have increased, it has been less quickly than people now increase in some of the oldest and most densely peopled countries of Europe. During some years this colony has been an independent state; but the people, dispersed over their vast and fertile plains, have almost ceased to cultivate the good land at their disposal; they subsist principally, many of them entirely, on the flesh of wild cattle; they have lost most of the arts of civilized life; not a few of them are constantly in a state of deplorable misery; and if they should continue, as it seems probable that they will, to retrograde as at present, the beautiful pampas of Buenos Ayres will soon be fit for another experiment in colonization. Slaves, black, red or yellow, would have cultivated those plains, would have been kept together, would have been made to assist each other; would, by keeping together and assisting each other, have

raised a surplus produce exchangeable in distant markets; would have kept their masters together for the sake of markets; would by combination of labour, have promoted division of employments; would, cattle themselves, have preserved amongst their masters the arts and habits of civilized life. That slavery might have done all this, seems not more plain than that so much good would have been bought too dear if its price had been slavery.

The last colony founded by Englishmen has severely felt the want of slavery. On the west coast of New Holland there is abundance of good land, and of land too, cleared and drained by nature. Those who have left England to settle there have carried out, amongst them, more than enough capital to employ such of them as were of the labouring class. The capital taken out, in seeds, implements, cattle, sheep and horses, cannot have been less, in money value, than 200,000*l.*; and the labourers must have amounted to a thousand at the very lowest. What is become of all that capital and all those labourers? The greater part of the capital has perished; some few of the labourers have died of hunger; some, falling into extreme want, have been glad to escape to Van Diemen's Land, where there are slaves; and the remainder are independent land-owners, isolated, not well supplied with even the necessaries of life, and as wild as Englishmen could become in so short a time. This colony may prosper in

the course of years; but for the present it must be considered, when compared with the expectations of those who founded it, a decided failure. Why this failure with all the elements of success, a fine climate, plenty of good land, plenty of capital and enough labourers? The explanation is easy. In this colony, there never has been a class of labourers. Those who went out as labourers no sooner reached the colony than they were tempted by the superabundance of good land to become landowners. One of the founders of the colony, Mr. Peel, who, it is said, took out a capital of 50,000*l.* and three hundred persons of the labouring class, men, women and children, has been represented as left without a servant to make his bed or fetch him water from the river.* The writer of the first book concerning this colony states, that landing in Cockburn Sound with goods taken from England, he did, with some difficulty, procure workmen to place his goods under a tent, but that there, for want of workmen to remove them, they remained till they were spoiled, as the tent became rotten. In such a state of things it was impossible to preserve capital. While Mr. Peel was without servants his capital perished; but as soon as his capital had perished for want of servants, those who had

* My authority for this statement is a gentleman, lately in England, who went to the Swan River as Mr. Peel's agent.

been his servants insisted on his giving them employment. Having tried a life of complete independence and felt the pains of hunger, they now wanted to become labourers again. At one time Mr. Peel was to be seen imploring his servants to remain with him, at another escaping from their fury at his not being able to give them work. The same thing happened in many cases. In each case, it was owing to the facility with which people, labourers when they reached the colony, became independent landowners. Some of these independent landowners died of hunger;* and at a time too when, as it happened, a large supply of food had just reached the colony from Van Diemen's Land. Why were they starved? because where they had settled was not known to the governor, or even to themselves; for, though they could say "we are here," they could not tell where any one else was: such was the dispersion of these colonists in consequence of superabundance of good land. Many of them, both capitalists and labourers, capitalists without capital and labourers without work, have removed to Van Diemen's Land; the cost of passage for the latter being defrayed by settlers in that slave-holding prosperous island. Some have wandered from the original place of settlement towards King George's Sound, in search, say they, of

* My authority is Mr. Peel's agent, Mr. Elmsley.

better land. Others, men of unusual courage and energy, remain on the banks of the Swan River, knowing well that the partial ruin of this colony is not owing to want of good land. These, one of whose chief inducements to settling in this colony was an undertaking from the English government that no convicts should be sent thither, are now begging for a supply of convict labour. They want slaves. They want labour which shall be constant and liable to combination in particular works. Having this, they would raise a net produce and have division of employments. Not having convict labour, they will long for African slaves; and would obtain them, too, if public opinion in England did not forbid it. Without either convicts or slaves, they may have herds of wild cattle, which supply food almost without labour; but they cannot have much more. Considering the superabundance of capital and labourers in England, the disposition of capitalists and labourers to emigrate in search of new fields of employment, the great natural advantages of this colony, and the false accounts of its prosperity now and then received in England, we should wonder that emigration to the Swan River had almost ceased, if that very fact did not show that by settling in this colony no well informed man can expect to better his condition. But the failure of this last experiment in colonization will have one good effect, if it help to teach

the English and Americans, that the original and permanent cause of slavery in America is superabundance of good land.*

The prospects of slavery in the West Indies and the United States may now be briefly considered; and, the cause of slavery being ascertained, with some chance of a useful result.

The slaves of the West Indies have just been turned into apprentices. As if on purpose that they should still be made to work like slaves, the planters' monopoly of the British market is preserved. Or, perhaps, since the negroes would not be worth a farthing apiece without the monopoly, it is preserved as an excuse for giving compensation to the planters. The monopoly being worth 2,000,000*l.* a year, the English buy it for 20,000,000*l.* let the sellers keep it, and will pay 2,000,000*l.* a

* Miss Martineau, the most entertaining of writers on political economy, in order to show how a society obtains wealth, has described the supposed case of some English people settling in a waste country, living together, combining their labour and dividing their employments. It is in this way, and only in this way, no doubt, that wealth is ever obtained; but any thing like the supposed case hardly ever, perhaps never, existed. If Miss Martineau had planted her settlers in an island of such an extent in proportion to their numbers that they should *necessarily* have lived together, her story would have been perfect; but she places them in a vast wilderness of good land, in a situation which, if we are to judge by all experience, is inconsistent with the combination of labour and the division of employments.

year as before, by way of bribing the planters to make the apprentices work like slaves. This, they call reformed legislation. It will probably be defeated by the apprentices; but, at all events, in however bungling or, may be, bloody a way, slavery will soon cease throughout the British West Indies.

If means be not soon found to abolish slavery in the United States, gradually and peacefully, it seems more than probable, that, what with the rapid increase of American slaves, already more than two millions, and the emancipation of eight hundred thousand English slaves in the neighbourhood of the United States, the slaves of the continent will, at no distant day, right themselves in the midst of Jefferson's thunder. "The Americans" says Mr. Stuart, "conceive that the increasing numbers of their slaves require more coercive laws and greater severity of treatment; and are proceeding on this principle, every year increasing the hardships of their almost intolerable situation, and adding new fetters to those which are already too heavy for them to wear." But what will the Americans conceive when the fetters worn by eight hundred thousand English slaves shall have been broken either by act of parliament or by those slaves themselves? Greater harshness in proportion to the greater danger will doubtless be their policy. That policy, which Mr. Stuart says, "no one unconnected with America can

wish may prove well-founded," is founded on experience. Experience has taught all slave-owners, that education and slavery, kindness and slavery, cannot go on together. As the slaves of the United States shall become more numerous, and as the danger of their learning that they are men shall become greater, either they must be set free, or greater pains must be taken to maintain their ignorance, torpidity and submissiveness; to hold them, mentally, in the state of brutes. But this policy may defeat its object, leading, sooner perhaps than might otherwise have happened, to a great servile war. That the slaves, once roused, would easily prove a match for their immediate masters may not be doubtful; but if the force of the whole Union were brought against them, ten millions of whites to two millions of blacks, they would, almost certainly, be conquered, and for a time subdued as before. In either case, there would be plenty of thunder; in either case, the prospect is as black as possible.

Will the Americans voluntarily set free their slaves, not having any substitute for the combined and constant labour of slaves? The answer is, that they will not, of their own accord, destroy property which they value at 120,000,000*l.* and which is really worth that sum at market.

Is there any prospect of such a fall in the value of slaves as might render slavery not worth preserving? Of this there is not, at present, the slightest prospect; because the white population wanting slaves increases as fast almost in number, as the slaves themselves, and faster in capital, for using which slaves are wanted; because superabundance of good land will continue to make slaves valuable, by enabling every freeman who so pleases to become an independent landowner.

But, considering that the Americans pay 3,600,000*l.* a year for the increase of slave labour, that the English pay about the same sum for the maintenance of idle paupers, might not these two sums, making together 7,200,000*l.*, be so employed in conveying to America the surplus labour of England, that, before very long, free labour should be substituted for slave labour in America? Supposing the cost of passage from England to America to be 10*l.*,* the yearly expenditure of 7,200,000*l.* in this way would take from England to America 720,000 labourers every year; about twelve times as many as the yearly increase of American slaves. In three years, the number of labourers so taken to America would be 160,000 more than *the whole number of American slaves.* In three years, then, it might be supposed, this great amount of immigration would extinguish slavery in America by the substitution of free

* The actual cost of a pauper's passage, with more and better food on the voyage than he obtains in England, is about 7*l.*

labour. But who would suppose this, that has observed the effects of superabundace of good land.* The 2,160,000 labourers taken to America might all of them, and would most of them, cease to be labourers for hire soon after landing in the new country; they would become independent landowners, competitors with American capitalists in the market of labour, and buyers of slaves. So vast an amount of immigration, therefore, instead of diminishing, would probably augment, the value of American slaves, and render the abolition of slavery in America still more difficult.

Still, as in America the whites are ten millions and the blacks but two millions; and as the whites increase at nearly as great a rate as the blacks: as the twelve millions will, there can hardly be any doubt, become twenty-four millions in the course of twenty-five years or less, is there no prospect that land will rise in value, so that every freeman shall no longer be able to obtain for a trifle more good land than he can possibly cultivate; so that the value of slaves shall fall; so that the proprietors of slaves, being most of them proprietors of land, shall be ready to liberate their slaves, gaining on the one hand as much as they might lose on the other, or more? Of this there is no prospect; for three reasons.

* See extract from Captain Basil Hall's letter to Mr. Wilmot Horton, in a note to Note I.

First, because, however rapidly population may increase, the quantity of land appropriated by individuals will increase at the same rate; because, in short, the colonization of new wilderness will go on as fast as population shall increase, so that every freeman will still be able to obtain for a trifle, more good land than he can possibly cultivate. Secondly, because the land east of the Alleghany mountains has been exhausted to a considerable extent, not merely for the growth of sugar, as in the West Indies, but fairly worn out by unskilful cultivation;* and thus, from this

* A writer in the Edinburgh Review, (Professor M'Culloch, I suspect) attributes the exhaustion and abandonment of land, in the eastern states, to a want of animal manure in consequence of the work of cattle being performed by men. Would not farms in England soon be exhausted if English farmers had no manure but what is furnished by their *working* cattle? There are many districts of Europe, such as the mountainous coasts of Spain and Italy, not to mention great part of China, where agricultural work is almost entirely performed by men, and where, notwithstanding, land is kept in the highest state of fertility by means of animal manure. The exhaustion of land in America is one of the evils, over and above slavery, resulting from superabundance of good land. The single, independent, landowner and cultivator, might not be able to live, still less to raise any surplus produce, if he were fixed on the same piece of land. He whose labour is already divided amongst so many occupations, would act a foolish part in adding to them the occupation of fetching manure, from a great distance perhaps, and the occupation of laying manure on his land, when for a trifle he can obtain of land very rich by nature more than he

exhausted district to new land in the western districts, emigration, both of whites and slaves,

can possibly cultivate. His labour being an isolated fraction, and being divided again amongst many employments, he must depend on nature for more than half the work. Keep him isolated, so that none shall help him nor he help any, so that he shall be obliged to do for himself all the many things required by him; do this, and prevent him from moving from one piece of land to another as the natural fertility of each piece is exhausted, and the result must be poverty, like that of the small French cultivator or Irish cottier. "We find all the farmers," says Mr. Stuart, "perfectly aware of the importance of fallow and green crops, but generally of opinion that they *dare not* attempt that system, on account of the high price of labour in this country in relation to the value of land; *ne sumptus fructum superet*, according to the sound advice of Varro. The price" [scarcity at any price] "of labour too, is the great obstacle to all sorts of ornamental improvements, such as the formation of gardens *and keeping them up*." *Vol.* 1, *page* 254.

"Let the settler be well advised, and not acquire land which has been already impoverished by cropping, and which has become foul and lost the vegetable mould." *Stuart, vol.* 1, page 254.

"When you talk to them, (the farmers) of the necessity of manuring with a view to preserve the fertility of the soil, they almost uniformly tell you that the expense," [meaning scarcity at whatever expense] "of labour renders it far more expedient for them, as soon as their repeated cropping very much diminishes the quantity of the grain, to lay down their land in grass, or make a purchase of new land in the neighbourhood, or even to sell their cleared land and *proceed in quest of a new settlement*, than to adopt a system of rotation of crops assisted by manure. There is great inconvenience, according to the notions of the British, in removing from one farm to another; but *they*

has taken place to a great amount and is still going on rapidly; so that in those exhausted districts, a fall rather than a rise in the value of land may be expected. Thirdly, because where the moral evils of slavery exist, there whites settle for one purpose only, that of gaining by the combined labour of slaves. But the greater part of the whites of America are content to share from a distance the economical advantages of slavery, without incurring its moral evils by going to live amongst slaves. The new settler on the Ohio can sell his honey, which may be raised without combined labour in that particular work, for tobacco, which may not, without hearing the smack of a slave-driver's whip, or the responding cry of slaves. If the white population of America were to be doubled every five years, instead of five and twenty years, the population of the slave states, where slave-owners own land, would not become sufficiently dense to raise the value of land and lower the value of slaves.

Superabundance of good land! If we have ascertained the cause of slavery in America, a little declamation on the subject may be allowed. The

make very light work of it here, and consider it to be merely a question of finance, *whether they shall remain on their improved land, after having considerably exhausted its fertilizing power, or acquire and remove to land of virgin soil*." *Stuart, vol.* 1, *page* 258. "If he obtains land near his first farm *after he has worn it out*." *Stuart, vol.* 2, *page* 359.

white Americans, speaking generally, would rejoice to get rid of slavery. They are men with the feelings of men; they can feel compassion and fear; they do pity their miserable slaves, and they hear the not far distant thunder, which threatens to steep half the Union in blood, and to ruin the other half. A successful rebellion of the slaves would more or less affect every white man in America, by causing a total revolution in all the markets for the produce of every kind of industry; and this the Americans in general know full well. Knowing this, they must also know what is the cause of slavery. Have they ever enquired whether it is possible to remove that most evil cause? They cannot alter the proportion between people and land in America; but the proportion between people and land *with a good title to it*, is within their controul. It is not often in America that any one uses land without a title; and this might easily be prevented altogether. The title to new land is given by the government. The government, therefore, or the people acting under the government, are able to regulate the proportion between numbers, and acres of appropriated land. In the colonies of old, that proportion depended on a thousand caprices, on the whims of an English king, of his colonial minister, of the minister's clerks or parasites, on the colonial governors, their clerks and parasites; all of whom bestowed grants of land pretty much as it pleased them; but in

the United States, which have adopted a system nearly uniform in the disposal of new land, the proportion between numbers and acres depends on the price per acre which congress thinks fit to require for all new land. The actual price is about five shillings per acre; and the sale of new land at this price yields near 700,000*l.* a year. That amount of revenue is employed for the general purposes of government. If it were employed in conducting pauper emigration from Europe, it would convey every year to the United States 80,000 persons of the labouring class; more than the yearly increase of slaves. If the price for new land were raised, so as to prevent those labourers from becoming independent landowners until others had followed to take their place; if the fund obtained by the sale of new land should thus become greater every year, and should always be employed in fetching labour from Europe; if by this increase in the price of new land and this immigration of labour, the people were less dispersed than they are, should help each other more, should produce more with the same labour, should have a higher rate of profit and a higher rate of wages; if, finally, a greater proportion of people to land in the states already settled should raise the value of land by means of all kinds of competition, over and above competition for superior natural fertility, then might free labour take the place of slave labour, then

might the owners of slaves and of land set free their slaves without loss, then might slavery be abolished without injury to any one, with the greatest benefit to all. By means of some plan of this kind, and by no other means, does it seem possible that slavery in America should be peacefully and happily abolished. Those Americans who would not prefer Jefferson's thunder, may, I trust, think it worth their while to examine this subject further in a subsequent note on the Art of Colonization.

NOTE XI.

APOLOGY FOR THE AMERICAN TARIFF.

Opinions of Englishmen respecting the tariff—moral advantages of the tariff—economical advantages of the tariff—difference of feeling between the Southern and Northern States respecting the tariff—the tariff good, upon the whole, for the people of America, and therefore a work becoming democratic government — when the tariff may be repealed with great advantage to America.

The following passage from an article in the *Times* newspaper on the late dispute between South Carolina and the United States, describes fully the opinions which are prevalent in England on the subject of the American tariff. "*All* political writers in this country have visited with censure the present policy of the American general government in attempting by high protecting duties to force the establishment, or to encourage the extension, of manufactures in the United States. With the high price for labour that exists in the United States, with their scanty supply of monied capital, with their unlimited range of uncultivated or half improved soil, it was almost *a crime*

against society to divert human industry from the fields and the forests to iron forges and cotton factories. Nature had pointed out the course which they ought to pursue for perhaps half a century to come, till the plough and the spade had followed the axe of the wood-cutter into their 'primeval wildernesses of shade,' and till happy plantations had been formed on the deserted domains of the Indian huntsman, from the Atlantic to the Ohio, and from the Mississippi to the Pacific. She had directed them to cling to the bosom of mother earth as to the most fertile source of wealth and the most abundant reward of labour. She had told them to remain planters, farmers, and wood-cutters—to extend society and cultivation to new regions—to practise and improve the arts of the builder, the carpenter, and the naval architect, to facilitate every means of internal communication—to promote every branch of internal trade—to encourage every variety of landed produce—but not to waste the energies of their labour, or to interrupt the course of their prosperity, by forcing at home the manufacture of articles, which foreigners could supply at half the price for which they could be made in America."

Englishmen who lean to democratic opinions are, most of them, if well-informed, advocates of free trade. To these, the American tariff is a very sore subject. If let alone, they would say nothing about it; and as it is, they do not say

much. But they are not let alone. The Conservatives place them in this dilemma—If, say those friends of the old commercial system, as of every thing old; if democratic government be good for a people, conducive to the benefit of all and so forth, then protection of domestic industry is for the public good, since the American tariff was established by a democracy; not preserved, mind, but begun and brought to perfection, deliberately, carefully, and in spite of arguments to the contrary: if on the other hand, the exclusion of foreign goods be hurtful to a people, what becomes of your government by all for the benefit of all? In this case, you cannot defend both, free trade *and* democracy; which do you give up?

The question is galling to an English liberal, puzzles and therefore irritates him. Hang the Americans with their tariff, one hears such a one complain, their stupidity is unaccountable. Another, admitting the stupidity, lays the blame on those governments of Europe which have set the Americans a bad example; as if precedent were an excuse for indulging mean and malignant passions. These terms are applicable to the grasping, selfish and jealous, spirit which dictated the commercial system of Europe; but they are quite inapplicable to those who established the American tariff; as I will now endeavour to prove, by shewing that a prohibitory system is, upon the

whole, useful to the people of America, and therefore a work becoming democratic government.

One motive, with some supporters of the English corn laws, is a fear lest the free importation of cheap corn should cause a great increase of town population; artizans, living together, talkers, readers of newspapers, intelligent, given to politics, unmanageable, radical; "fierce democrats." If, say they, you sacrifice the agricultural to the manufacturing and commercial interests, the glory of England will pass away; meaning, if you repeal the corn laws the number of our stupid country paupers will perhaps be less, while the number of knowing people, living in towns, independent of us, will surely be greater. No doubt; but the free importation of cheap manufactured goods would have a contrary, a precisely opposite, effect in America; that is, would cause a decrease of town population and an increase of rural population. If English manufactured goods were let into the United States duty free, that portion of the capital and labour of America, which is now employed in making goods of that kind, would be diverted to agriculture. Upon this point there can be no dispute. Let us further admit, that the Americans might obtain better and cheaper manufactured goods by raising corn for the English market than by making such goods themselves; just as the

English might obtain better and cheaper corn with steam engines than with ploughs. If so, the Americans lose by the tariff, speaking economically; but now turn to the political side of the account.

Is it desirable that a very large proportion of the people should consist of husbandmen, such as the English term clodhoppers; earth-scratchers,* they ought to be called in America? Yes, without doubt, provided this be the only way in which every member of the society may obtain plenty; but in America profits and wages, both, are so high, that if an economical sacrifice for a political gain be made, it is not felt. Not being felt, it is not a sacrifice; while the gain is palpable. Supposing that American industry is less productive than it might be, still it produces enough; and in order to make it produce more than enough a great political advantage must be sacrificed; the advantage of so much town population as would have consisted of mere husbandmen if the tariff had not excluded foreign manufactured goods.† In

* "An English farmer," says Washington, writing to Arthur Young, "ought to have a horrid idea of the state of our agriculture, or of the nature of our soil, when he is informed that one acre with us only produces eight or ten bushels. But it must be kept in mind, that where land is cheap and labour dear," [scarce] "men are fonder of cultivating much than cultivating well. Much ground has been *scratched*, and none cultivated as it ought to be."

† "This gentleman told me that that the first child born at

America, whatever tends to keep people together is of inestimable advantage. Camp meetings are very useful as they bring people together, though but now and then. The tariff, by inducing so many people to become manufacturers, has prevented so many people from becoming backwoodsmen; has created and maintains so many towns, with the roads between them; has bestowed upon all the people in and near those towns the great advantage of social intercourse; has checked emigration from old settlements to the western wilderness, fixing so much population as would otherwise have rolled on towards the Pacific. The tariff, therefore, counteracts in some degree the barbarising tendency of dispersion; and for that most useful quality is well worth some economical sacrifice, if there be any.

I say, if there be any; for the economical sacrifice is not so plain. Supposing that if there were no tariff the manufacturers of America would employ their capital and labour in agriculture, skilfully like the English, with sufficient combination to obtain the greatest produce with the least number of hands; in that case, capital and labour being applied with the utmost skill to

Rochester (New York State) after the settlement of the place, *eighteen years ago*, was his son. The place only contained 1,000 inhabitants, and now (1828) about 13,000. There are cotton works, power-looms, woollen factories, ELEVEN FLOUR MILLS, AND SIX OR SEVEN CHURCHES." *Stuart, vol.* 1, *page* 81.

the very fertile soil of America, corn of all kinds would be raised so as to be sold for a lower price than the lowest price for which corn was ever sold, and in this way the Americans would obtain from the English (the English tariff being repealed) the cheapest manufactured goods. Under that supposition the economical loss resulting from the tariff might be reckoned very great. But capital and labour would not be so applied to the soil of America. Judging, at least, from all experience, the capital and labour which were diverted from manufactures to agriculture would, *because* it was agriculture, *because land was in the case*, be divided into small separate parts and employed in the least skilful manner, trusting for little to skill, to nature for much,* and

* "All the unburnt new lands in the northern, middle, southern and western states have been, and still are, uniformly valued beyond their real worth. When the tract on the green mountains of Massachussetts was first settled, the same luxuriant fertility was attributed to it, which has since characterized Kentucky. About the same time it was ascribed to the valley of Housatonnuc in the county of Berkshire. From these tracts it was transferred to the lands in New Hampshire and Vermont, on the western side of the Green Mountains. From these regions *the paradise has travelled* to the western part of the state of New York, to New Connecticut, to Upper Canada, to the countries on the Ohio, to the south western territory, and is now making its progress over the Mississippi into the newly purchased regions of Louisiana. The accounts given of all these countries successively was extensively true; but *the conclusions which*

obtaining, even with that most generous nature, but a small produce in proportion to the number of hands employed; just as, in America, capital and labour (slaves excepted) are now employed in agriculture. In this case, many who do now obtain plenty of manufactured goods, though dear, might not be able to obtain any at whatever price.

The tariff, besides, is an act of combination; an agreement amongst the people for distribution of employments. Those farmers for whom the tariff, by creating towns, has created markets*

were deducted from them were in great measure erroneous. So long as this mould remains, the produce will regularly be great, and that with very imperfect cultivation; but this mould, after a length of time, will be dissipated; where lands are continually ploughed it is soon lost; on those which are covered with grass from the beginning, it is preserved through a considerable period. At length, however, every appearance of its efficacy, and even of its existence, vanishes." Dr. Dwight—quoted by Stuart, *vol.* 1, *page* 264.

* "He" (a farmer near Springfield in Illinois) "has advantages, too, in point of situation, being nearer to the Galena lead mines, to which he last year sold 8,000 wooden posts at three dollars per hundred. He had been in Scotland; but there was no land in that country to be compared (he said) to that of his farm. Finding him so much disposed to praise, I asked him how he was off for servants. His answer was marked 'you have hit the nail on the head—it is difficult to get servants here, and more difficult to get good ones.'" *Stuart, vol.* 2, *page* 359.

near to their own farms, would by a repeal of the tariff lose those markets, and must convey their net produce to more distant markets, if such there were, and if the cost of such longer conveyance did not deter them from raising food for market. Either, then, their industry would be less productive, the cost of its produce at market being greater; or they would be less industrious, like hundreds of thousands of settlers far from a market for net produce, who loiter away one half of their time and waste a good deal of the other half by dividing their labour amongst several employments. Division of employments, says Adam Smith, meaning the reverse of division of labour, is limited by the extent of the market; he might have added, and so is industry itself.* Each manufacturer, then, and each of those farmers who now live near to a town, becoming isolated

* "The power of exchanging is the *vivifying principle of industry.* It stimulates agriculturists *to adopt the best system of cultivation,* and to raise the largest crops; because it enables them to exchange whatever portion of the produce of their lands exceeds their own consumption, for other commodities conducive to their comforts or enjoyments; and it equally stimulates manufacturers to improve the quantity and variety of their goods, that they may thereby be enabled to obtain a greater quantity of raw produce. A spirit of industry is thus universally diffused; and that apathy and languor, which are characteristic of a rude state of society, entirely disappear." *Professor M'Culloch's Edition of Smith's Wealth of Nations. Note* 19, *vol.* 4. *page* 474.

cultivators, without a motive for raising more than should supply their own wants, would soon be contented with a rude house, coarse food and rough clothes as necessaries, with tobacco, rum, a rifle and ammunition as luxuries. This does nearly always happen to those, who impelled by a spirit of adventure settle far away from any market. In this way, the American demand for manufactured goods would be less, the wants of so many people would decrease, and the sum total of things useful or agreable to man enjoyed in America would be less; a loss economically speaking, or I have yet to learn the alphabet of political economy. The loss, morally or politically speaking, need not be mentioned again.

But, an English economist may ask, why should not the Americans combine with the English for a division of employments between the two nations which would be equally useful to both parties? Because, I answer, general combination of power, which leads to general division of employments, is useless, or rather impossible, without combination of capital and labour, and division of employments, in particular works. Exchange to any great extent cannot take place unless *two* parties raise a surplus produce, unless the produce of *both* parties be great in proportion to the hands employed; and in America particular combination of power, with particular division of employments, will not take place so long as any

quantity of good land may be obtained by any body for the low price of five shillings per acre. Evils resulting from the very low price of waste land meet one at every turn in America.

With slaves, however, this particular combination of capital and labour is possible in America. The whites of the southern states are able to raise cheap commodities; much, that is, in proportion to the hands employed; commodities which being cheap would be exchangeable in the English market. To the whites of the Southern States, therefore, the tariff is injurious, limiting their foreign market for the sale of corn, rice, tobacco, cotton and sugar. This accounts for their dislike of the tariff. But the northern states, wanting slaves, want, besides those southern markets which slavery and the tariff combined provide for the various products of their industry, other markets, nearer to their own particular works; a demand for the produce of much divided capital and labour, for dear commodities which would not bear the cost of conveyance to very distant markets;* and this want of domestic markets is

* "Potatoes, turnips, ruta-baga, peas, lucern, &c. are all to be seen here (New York State) in small quantities, but not so well managed as in well-cultivated districts of Britain. The high price" [scarcity] "of labour is the great obstacle to the management which those crops require. It is *not because the farmer does not understand his business* that such crops are apparently not sufficiently attended to, but because he, in all cases, calculates whether it will not be more profitable for him to

to some extent supplied by the tariff. The affection of the northern states for the tariff is thus fully explained. As in the southern states slavery, so in the northern states the tariff, is an expedient, a shift, for correcting the mischievous influence of dispersion.

Well then, it may be said, if the two divisions of the union have such different interests, in consequence of the difference between their respective shifts for correcting the mischievous influence of dispersion, why should they not have separate governments, a northern and a southern union; one with, the other without, a tariff? For several reasons. First, because the expedient of

remove his establishment to a new and hitherto unimpoverished soil, than to commence and carry on an extensive system of cultivation by manuring and fallow or green crops. Such a system may be adopted *in the neighbourhood of great towns,* where *many green crops are easily disposed of,* and where manure can be had in large quantities and at a cheap rate; but it is in vain to look for its adoption generally, or to expect to see agricultural operations in their best style until the land even in the most distant states and territories be occupied, so that the farmer may no longer find it more for his interest to begin his operations anew, on land previously uncultivated, *than to manage his farm* according *to the method which will render it most productive.*" * * * * " From what I have been told, I suspect it will be found that, after the effect of the vegetable matter on the surface of the land cleared is at an end, the average crops of all sorts of grain are, according to the prevailing system of management in this state, *a half or nearly a half, less than on similar soils in Britain.*" *Stuart, vol.* 1, *page* 162.

the south is useful to the north, providing extensive, though distant, markets for the products of northern industry; for the manufactures, ships, steam-boats, cattle and very many things besides, which are produced in the states that forbid slavery, which would not be produced if there were no demand for them, and for which there would be less demand if the southern states, having free trade, should buy what they required in the cheapest market they could any where find.* Secondly, because the special expedient of the south could not be maintained without assistance from the north; the force of the whole union being required to preserve slavery, to keep down the slaves. If the southern states, urged by hatred of the tariff, should declare themselves independent, they would presently lose that power of raising exchangeable commodities which is the ground-work of their dislike to the tariff. Losing their slaves, they too, like the northern states, would want a tariff to counteract dispersion, to preserve some combination of capital and labour, and some division of employments; or, at the

* Mr. Stuart, speaking of a district in the state of Illinois, says, " There is never any want of a market. Every thing is bought by the merchants for New Orleans or for Galena, where a vast number of workmen are congregated, who are employed in the lead mines on the north-western parts of this state." New Orleans is a great market, because of slavery; Galena, because of the tariff.

least, to create domestic markets; a demand for the produce of scattered capital and labour. Give and take, live and let live, is a maxim every where understood. In order to preserve their own special expedient, slavery, the southern states must put up with the special expedient of the northern states, which is the tariff. Upon the whole, therefore, the tariff appears useful to the people of America; and as the people of America govern themselves for their own good, it will not, probably, be repealed, though it may be altered in various ways, until the price of land shall rise considerably through the increase of people a century hence, or earlier by the will of the people, who can put what price they please upon grants in the desert. If the price of new land were such, that free labour should always be obtainable for combination in farming, then, with a greater produce from capital and labour, with higher profits and higher wages, the Americans would raise cheaper corn than has ever been raised; and, no longer wanting a tariff, might drive with the manufacturers of England the greatest trade ever known in the world.

NOTE XII.

THE ART OF COLONIZATION.

Introduction—nature and limits of the subject—the ends of colonization as respects the mother-country—the extension of markets—relief from excessive numbers—enlargement of the field for employing capital—ends of colonization as respects the colony—the means of colonization—the disposal of waste land—the removal of people—co-operation of the mother-country—the foundation of colonies—the government of colonies.

INTRODUCTION.

Considering that the world has been peopled by the removal of people from old societies to settle in new places, and that the large portion of the earth, which is still desert, will probably become inhabited by the same means, but certainly by no other means; seeing, therefore, that the art of colonization is one of vast importance to mankind, it does appear strange that this subject should not have been thoroughly examined by any writer on political economy. Under the head of *Colonies*, we have, indeed, many treatises; but not one, as far as I know, in which the ends and means of colonization have been fully described,

or even noticed with so much as a show of method and accuracy. Of those treatises, some are confined to a mere history of the Greek colonies; while in others, which profess to embrace the whole subject of colonial policy, not only is the subject examined superficially and carelessly, but whenever the writer appears to be in earnest, he either dwells on points which are foreign to the matter in hand, or mixes the plainest misstatements of fact with the grossest errors of reasoning. Two examples will suffice to prove this assertion.

Professor M'Culloch, in a note appended to Adam Smith's chapter on the "Foundation of Colonies," after giving a list of works on colonial policy, says, "The article *Colony*, in the *Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica*, written by Mr. Mill, is one of the ablest of the recent disquisitions on the subject." A most able disquisition it is truly, on several subjects, but not on colonization. It contains the shortest and clearest explanation ever given of the symptoms of poverty in old countries; some very good reasons why transportation is a very bad mode of punishing criminals, and some very conclusive arguments against commercial restrictions and bounties; but of colonization, its objects and means, Mr. Mill says next to nothing. He says, indeed, that "colonization, with a view to the relief of the mother country by a diminution of numbers,

deserves profound regard;" and then proceeds to recommend, as "the best means of checking the progress of population," that "the superstitions of the nursery should be discarded," in order to the adoption of a physical check to the procreation of children. Returning to colonization with a view to relief from excessive numbers, he disposes of the whole subject in a few lines; saying, that on two conditions, but not otherwise, "a body of people may be advantageously removed from one country for the purpose of colonizing another;" when, first, "the land which they are about to occupy should be capable of yielding a greater return to their labour, than the land which they leave;" and, secondly, "when the expense of removal from the mother country to the colony, which is usually created by distance, should not be too great." This is all. The "*Conclusion*" of Mr. Mill's essay, accounts for his having been content with uttering a pair of mere truisms on a subject, which, he says, deserves profound regard. Here he asserts the "tendency of colonial possessions to produce or prolong bad government," and emphatically condemns colonization as a fruitful source of jobs, monopolies and wars. Be it so; but is this the only matter of bad government? would there have been no wars, monopolies or jobs without colonies? is every thing bad, including the wealth of nations, which has formed the matter of jobs, monopolies and wars? are we

to regret the existence of the United States because they were not founded without some great evils? has not colonization been a source of much good, as well as of some harm, to mankind? may not the evils be avoided in future, more good than ever being obtained? is there not in the founding of new states, as in the government of old ones, a way of proceeding better than all the others? If Mr. Mill had asked himself these questions before he wrote on colonies, his essay would probably have deserved Mr. M'Culloch's admiration. In that case, he would have told us something, at least, about the United States, which still receive from other countries, and pour forth to reclaim the wilderness, great streams of population; about the influence of this gradual increase of land, in proportion to the increase of people, in rendering a people fit to enjoy self-government or democratic institutions; about the increased enjoyments of Europe arising from the discovery of new productions in her colonies; about the stimulus given to European industry and skill, by the formation of new markets; about the reasons why, since the time of the ancient Greeks, at least, colonization has not been made useful for relieving an old country from excessive numbers; and, perhaps, about the best means of reclaiming desert countries with that all important object. As it is, his essay may be called a treatise, and a very able one, on population,

punishment, monopolies and patronage, with a few careless remarks on colonization.

Adam Smith has written at great length on Colonies, but not with much more care than Mr. Mill; as the reader will perceive who shall take the trouble to examine the following statement of "*the Causes of the Prosperity of New Colonies.*"*

"The colony of a civilized nation which takes possession either of a waste country, or of one so thinly inhabited that the natives easily give place to the new settlers, advances more rapidly to wealth and greatness than any other human society."

This assertion does not rest on facts. Some few new colonies have advanced very rapidly in population; but scarce any have advanced rapidly to wealth and greatness; while, as I have had occasion to observe before, the greater number of colonies have perished, or, at least, have remained for a long while less prosperous and civilized than their mother countries. Amongst bodies of people who take possession of a waste country, the general rule seems to be, very slow progress towards wealth and greatness, with an exception now and then. The exceptions are not very striking. The only exceptions that strike one at all are the United States, Upper Canada (for Lower Canada was never a prosperous colony), and the

* See Professor M'Culloch's Edition of *the Wealth of Nations*, vol. 2, p. 460.

penal settlements of the English in Australia. An increase of population, taken by itself, proves nothing; since in Ireland, one of the most miserable countries of Europe, people have increased of late years almost as fast as in the United States. The progress of the United States in wealth, since they became independent, has not been nearly so great as that of England during the same period. No one pretends that the settlers of Upper Canada are a wealthy people; and their prosperity, such as it is, seems to be owing mainly to an amount of immigration, both of capital and people, from a rich old country, far greater than ever occurred before in the history of colonization. As for the penal settlements of the English in Australia, they are societies altogether unnatural; having been founded, and being maintained, by the government of England with the produce of taxes paid by the people of England. Some persons, not convicts, are established there. These the English government supplies with slaves free of prime cost. The convict labourers, being forced to work in combination, raise more produce than they consume. But of what use would be surplus produce without a market in which to dispose of it? Such a market the English government provides for the farmers of New South Wales, by maintaining a civil and military establishment, which costs 300,000*l.* a year. The local government buys the surplus produce of the settlers,

either with bills drawn on the English treasury, or with specie sent from the English mint. With these bills and this money, the settlers obtain various articles of comfort and luxury; manufactured goods from England, wine from Spain and France, sugar from the Isle of France, tobacco from Brazil, spices from the Indian Archipelago, and tea from China. The government first supplies the settlers with labour, and then buys, with exchangeable commodities, the surplus produce of that labour. In this way, a great trade has been maintained;* great, that is, in proportion to the people who were there to conduct it. That trade could not but be very profitable, so long as the demand of the government exceeded the supply of the colony; and this excess of demand over supply continued until lately. The high profits of that trade, and the high wages also

* When the English colonial minister boasts in Parliament of the revenue raised by duties of customs in New South Wales, he seems to forget, that the trade on which those duties are levied is nothing but a certain mode of expenditure by the English government. He might as well boast of having got a revenue by taxes on the stone and wood used in building the palace at Pimlico. A portion of the money, which the English pay for keeping convicts at New South Wales, is made to pass, and not by a very indirect process, through the hands of the custom-house officers at Sydney: whereupon the English colonial minister, who has all the patronage attendant on that distant and most costly jail, exclaims—Here's a flourishing colony for you!

which every free labourer who chose to take part in it could obtain, have induced the colonists to keep together; whilst the management of that trade called for a division of employments, such as, I believe, never occurred before in any colony so lately established. The unnatural causes of the prosperity of this colony show in a striking manner, that new colonies in general are not apt to be prosperous. The only *new* colonies that have been remarkably prosperous, are those of the ancient Greeks. Here follows Adam Smith's statement of the causes of their prosperity.

"The colonists carry out with them a knowledge of agriculture and other useful arts, superior to what can grow up of its own accord in the course of many centuries amongst savage and barbarous nations. They carry out with them too the habit of subordination, some notion of the regular government which takes place in their own country, of the system of laws which support it, and of a regular administration of justice; and they naturally establish something of the same kind in the new settlement. But among savage and barbarous nations, the natural progress of law and government is still slower than the natural progress of arts, after law and government have been so far established as is necessary for their protection. *Every colonist gets more land than he can possibly cultivate.* He has no rent and scarce any taxes to pay. No landlord

shares with him in its produce, and the share of the sovereign is commonly but a trifle. He has every motive to render as great as possible a produce which is thus to be almost entirely his own. But his land is commonly so extensive that with all his own industry, and with all the industry of other people whom he can get to employ, he can seldom make it produce the tenth part of what it is capable of producing. He is eager therefore to collect labourers from all quarters, and to reward them with the most liberal wages. Those liberal wages, joined to *the plenty and cheapness of land*, soon make those labourers leave him, in order to become landlords themselves, and to reward, with equal liberality, other labourers, who soon leave them for the same reason that they left their first master. The liberal reward of labour encourages marriage. The children, during the tender years of infancy, are well taken care of; and when they are grown up the value of their labour greatly overpays their maintenance. When arrived at maturity, *the high price of labour and the low price of land*, enable them to establish themselves in the same manner as their fathers did before them. In other countries, rent and profit eat up wages, and the two superior orders of people oppress the inferior one. But in new colonies, the interest of the two superior orders obliges them to treat the inferior one with more generosity and humanity; at least *where that in-*

ferior one is not in a state of slavery. Waste lands of the greatest natural fertility are to *be had for a trifle.* The increase of revenue which the proprietor, who is also the undertaker, expects from their improvement, constitutes his profit; which in these circumstances is commonly very great. But this great profit cannot be made without employing the labour of other people in clearing and cultivating the land; and the disproportion between the great extent of the land and the small number of people, which commonly takes place in new colonies, makes it difficult for him to get this labour. He does not therefore dispute about wages, but is willing to employ labour at any price. The *high wages of labour* encourage population. The *cheapness and plenty* of good land encourage improvement and enable the proprietor to pay those high wages. In those wages consists almost the whole price of the land: and though they are high, considered as the wages of labour, they are low, considered as the price of what is so very valuable. What encourages the progress of population and improvement encourages that of real wealth and greatness. The progress of many of the Greek colonies towards wealth and greatness, seems *accordingly* to have been very rapid. In the course of a century or two, several of them appear to have rivalled, and even to have surpassed their mother cities. Syracuse and Agrigentum in Sicily,

Tarentum and Locri in Italy, Ephesus and Miletus in Lesser Asia, appear, by all accounts, to have been at least equal to any of the cities of ancient Greece."

This passage contains a curious mixture of truth and error. It is the error that concerns us here. With respect to the colonies of Greece, there is not a word of truth in the whole passage. The remarkable prosperity of those colonies is attributed to superabundance or extreme cheapness of land, and to dearness of labour or high wages. But the emigrants from Greece did not, most certainly, obtain great tracts of land over which to spread at will. There is no instance of their having advanced far from the sea shore. Wherever they landed, they had to displace warlike tribes who, abandoning the coast after a struggle, continued to watch the intruders and to confine them within very narrow limits; within a short stripe of land. The first occupation of a Greek colony seems to have been to build a fortress, into which the whole body of colonists might retire when attacked. Some of those strong places became very soon great towns; but the quantity of land required to feed the inhabitants of one great town, formed, in most cases, the whole territory of a Greek colony from the beginning to the end of its career. Abundance and consequent cheapness of land, therefore, was not a cause of the prosperity of the Greek colonies.

In the next place, dearness of labour, or high wages, are terms which emigrants from Greece would not have understood even. In no Greek colony did any one ever sell his labour; or any one pay wages, high or low; for all the works of those societies, the cultivation of their small territory, the building of their houses, the making of their tools, clothes, furniture, roads, carriages, and ships, and also the exchanges which took place either within a colony, or between a colony and other states; all these works, so far as respects labour, were performed exclusively by slaves.

The account, therefore, which the father of the English economists has given of the causes of the prosperity of those colonies whose prosperity is the most remarkable, is obviously, nay, grossly incorrect. From these two examples of careless writing about colonies, by the first and the last distinguished Englishmen who have professed to examine the subject, it may be inferred that the subject has never been carefully examined. They are noticed, by way of apology for conducting this enquiry with a degree of method, care and fullness, which would have been pedantic or impertinent if such a course had ever been pursued before.

NATURE AND LIMITS OF THE SUBJECT.

The word colony, is used to express very different ideas. A conquered nation, amongst whom

the victors do not settle, even a mere factory for trade, has commonly been termed a colony; as for example the English factories in India and the actual dominion of the English in that country. Mere stations also for military or trading purposes, such as Malta and Heligoland, go by the name of colonies. In like manner, the penal settlements or distant gaols of the English are superintended by their colonial minister, and were called colonies even when their whole population consisted of prisoners and keepers. Two societies more different than the people of India ruled by the servants of a London trading company, and the convicts of New South Wales before Englishmen not criminals began to settle there, could not well be imagined. But the difference between the ideas often expressed by the term colony is matched by the caprice with which that term is used. The settlements of the Greeks in Sicily and Asia Minor, independent states from the beginning, have always been termed colonies: the English settlements in America were termed colonies, though in local matters they governed themselves from the beginning, so long as England monopolized their foreign trade and managed their external relations; but from the time when England attempted to interfere with their domestic government and happily lost both the monopoly of their foreign trade and the management of their foreign relations, they have

not been reckoned as colonies. According to the loose way in which this term has been used, it is not dependence that constitutes a colony; nor is it the continual immigration of people from distant places, since in this respect the United States surpass all other countries. In order to express the idea of a society, which continually receives bodies of people from distant places, and sends out bodies of people to settle permanently in new places, no distinctive term has yet been used. This, however, is the idea which will be expressed whenever the term colony is used here; the idea of a society at once immigrating and emigrating, such as the United States of America and the English settlements in Canada, South Africa and Australia.

For the existence of a colony two things are indispensable; first, waste land, that is, land not yet the property of individuals, but liable to become so through the intervention of government; and secondly, the migration of people; the removal of people to settle in a new place. Further it will be seen at once, that this migration must be of two kinds; first, the removal of people from an old to a new country; secondly, the removal of people from a settled part to a waste part of the colony. Colonization, then, signifies the removal of people from an old to a new country, and the settlement of people on the waste land of the new country. As in this there

is more to be done than to be learned, this is an art rather than a science. In every art, the means to be employed ought to be regulated strictly by the ends in view. The first point, therefore, in this enquiry is the ends of colonization.

Two very different societies may have a common interest in colonization, though with objects widely different in some respects. The English, for example, may have a deep interest in removing people to America for the sake of relief from excessive numbers; while the Americans, cursed with slavery, might gain incalculably by receiving numbers of people from England. The ends of colonization, therefore, may be divided into two classes; those which belong to the old country, and those which belong to the colony. Each class of objects will be best ascertained by being examined separately.

THE ENDS OF COLONIZATION AS RESPECTS THE MOTHER-COUNTRY.

It may be questioned whether, in modern times at least, any old state has founded or extended a colony with any definite object whatever. The states of ancient Greece are supposed by Mr. Mill to have sent forth bodies of emigrants deliberately with a view to relief from excessive numbers; and he has shown in a very clear and forcible manner that the rulers of those states had

a strong motive for seeking that relief in that way, while no such motive was likely to occur to the rulers of modern Europe.* The rulers of

* "A curious phenomenon here presents itself. A redundancy of population, in the states of ancient Greece, made itself visible even to vulgar eyes. A redundancy of population in modern Europe never makes itself visible to any but the most enlightened eyes. Ask an ordinary man, ask almost any man, if the population of this country be too great; if the population of any country in Europe is, or ever was too great: so far, he will tell you, is it from being too great, that good policy would consist in making it, if possible, still greater; and he might quote in his own support, the authority of almost all governments, who are commonly at pains to prevent the emigration of their people, and to give encouragement to marriage.

The explanation of the phenomenon is easy; but it is also of the highest importance. When the supply of food is too small for the population, the deficiency operates, in modern Europe, in a manner different from that in which it operated in ancient Greece. In modern Europe, the greatest portion of the food is bought by the great body of the people. What the great body of the people have to give for it is nothing but labour. When the quantity of food is not sufficient for all, and when some are in danger of not getting any, each man is induced, in order to secure a portion to himself, to give better terms for it than any other man; that is, more labour. In other words, that part of the population, who have nothing to give for food but labour, take less wages. This is the primary effect, clear, immediate, certain. It is only requisite further to trace the secondary or derivative effects.

When we say, that in the case in which the supply of food has become too small for the population, the great body of the people take less wages, that is less food, for their labour; we

modern Europe, however, have had a motive of affection for colonies. "Sancho Panza," says

mean that they take less than is necessary for their comfortable subsistence; because they would only have what is necessary for comfortable subsistence in the case in which the supply of food is not too small for the whole.

The effect, then, of a disproportion between the food and the population is, not to feed to the full measure that portion of the population which it is sufficient to feed, and to leave the redundant portion destitute; it is to take, according to a certain rate, a portion of his due quantity from each individual of that great class who have nothing to give for it but ordinary labour.

What this state of things imports is most easily seen. The great class, who have nothing to give for food but ordinary labour, are the great body of the people. When every individual in the great body of the people has less than the due quantity of food, less than would fall to his share if the quantity of food were not too small for the population, the state of the great body of the people is the state of sordid, painful and degraded poverty. They are wretchedly fed, wretchedly clothed, have wretched houses, and neither time nor means to keep their houses or their persons free from disgusting impurity. Those of them, who, either from bodily infirmities, have less than the ordinary quantity of labour to bestow, or, from the state of their families, need a greater than the ordinary quantity of food, are condemned to starve; either wholly, if they have not enough to keep them alive; or partially, if they have enough to yield them a lingering, diseased, and, after all, a shortened existence.

What the ignorant and vulgar spectator sees in all this, is not a redundant population: it is only a poor population. He sees nobody without food who has enough to give for it. To his eye, therefore, it is not food which is wanting, but that which is to be given for it. When events succeed in this

Mr. Mill "had a scheme for deriving advantage from the government of an island. He would

train, and are viewed with those eyes, there never can appear to be a redundancy of population.

Events succeeded in a different train in the states of ancient Greece, and rendered a redundancy of population somewhat more visible, even to vulgar and ignorant eyes.

In ancient Greece, the greatest portion of the food was not bought by the great body of the people; the state of whom, wretched or comfortable, legislation has never yet been wise enough much to regard. All manual labour, or, at least, the far greater portion of it, was performed, not by free labourers serving for wages, but by slaves, who were the property of the great men. The deficiency of food, therefore, was not distributed in the shape of general poverty and wretchedness over the great body of the population, by reduction of wages; a case which affects with very slight sensations those who regard themselves as in no degree liable to fall into that miserable situation. It was felt, first of all, by the great men, in the greater cost of maintaining their slaves. And what is felt as disagreeable by the great men, is sure never to continue long without an effort, either wise or foolish, for the removal of it. This law of human nature was not less faithfully observed in the states of ancient Greece, for their being called republics. Called republics, they in reality were aristocracies; and aristocracies of a very bad description. They were aristocracies in which the people were cheated with an idea of power, merely because they were able, at certain distant intervals, when violently excited, to overpower the aristocracy in some one particular point; but they were aristocracies, in which there was not one efficient security to prevent the interests of the many from being sacrificed to the interests of the few; they were aristocracies, accordingly, in which the interests of the many were habitually sacrificed to the interests

sell the people for slaves, and put the money into his pocket. The Few, in some countries, find in

of the few; meaning by the many, not the slaves merely, but the great body of the free citizens. This was the case in all the states of Greece, and not least in Athens. This is not seen in reading the French and English histories of Greece. It is not seen in reading Mitford, who has written a history of Greece for no other purpose but that of showing, that the interests of the many always *ought* to be sacrificed to the interests of the few; and of abusing the people of Greece, because, every now and then, the many in those countries showed, that they were by no means patient under the habitual sacrifice of their interests to the interests of the few. But it is very distinctly seen, amongst other occasions, in reading the Greek orators, in reading Demosthenes, for example, in reading the Oration against Midias, the Oration on Leptines, and others; in which the license of the rich and powerful, and their means of oppressing the body of the people, are shown to have been excessive, and to have been exercised with a shameless atrocity, which the gentleness and modesty of the manners of modern Europe, even in the most aristocratically despotic countries, wholly preclude.

In Greece, then, any thing which so intimately affected the great men, as a growing cost of maintaining their slaves, would not long remain without serious attempts to find a remedy.

It was not, however, in this way alone, that a redundant population shewed itself in Greece. As not many of the free citizens maintained themselves by manual labour, they had but two resources more,—the land and profits of stock. Those who lived on profits of stock, did so, commonly, by employing slaves in some of the known arts and manufactures, and of course were affected by the growing cost of maintaining their slaves. Those who lived on the produce of a certain portion of the land, could not but exhibit, very distinctly, the redun-

colonies a thing which is very dear to them ; they find, the one part of them, the precious matter with which to influence ; the other, the precious matter with which *to be* influenced ;—the one, the precious matter with which to make political dependents ; the other, the precious matter with which they are made political dependents ; the one, the precious matter by which they augment their power ; the other the precious matter by which they augment their riches. Both portions of the ruling Few, therefore, find their account in the possession of colonies. There is not one of the colonies, but what augments the number of places. There are governorships and judgeships and a long train of *etceteras ;* and, above all, there is not one of them but what requires an additional number of troops and an additional portion of navy. In every additional portion of army and navy, besides the glory of the thing,

dancy of their numbers, when, by the multiplication of families, portions came to be so far subdivided, that what belonged to each individual was insufficient for his maintenance.

In this manner, then, it is very distinctly seen, why, to vulgar eyes, there never appears, in modern Europe, to be any redundancy of population, any demand for relieving the country by carrying away a portion of the people ; and why, in ancient Greece, that redundancy made itself to be very sensibly perceived ; and created, at various times, a perfectly efficient demand for removing to distant places a considerable portion of the people." *Article Colony, in the Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica.*

there are generalships and colonelships and captainships, and lieutenantships ; and in the equipping and supplying of additional portions of army and navy, there are always gains which may be thrown in the way of a friend. All this is enough to account for a very considerable quantity of affection maintained towards colonies." For the affection of the rulers this is enough, but not for that of the nations. The nations of modern Europe have had a very different motive of affection for colonies ; a sense of the benefits derived from the discovery of new productions and the creation of new markets. Those Englishmen, for instance, who during the last century and a half have shouted, "Ships, Colonies and Commerce !" were good political economists. If they did not know scientifically, that all improvements in the productive powers of industry, that industry itself, is limited by the extent of the market, still they felt that every new colony, or every enlargement of an old one, increased by so much the means of exchanging the produce of English labour, and by so much increased the wealth of England. Who that produces does not feel, though he may be unable to account for it, the advantage of having some other ready to deal with him for the surplus produce of his labour ? A desire for new markets has, indeed, scarcely ever been the deliberate motive for establishing a colony ; nor perhaps did any go-

vernment ever establish a colony deliberately for the sake of patronage. But, colonies having been established, sometimes by the adventurous spirit of individuals, sometimes by religious persecution, the governments and nations of modern Europe had strong motives of affection towards them; the governments, for the sake of patronage; the nations, for the sake of markets. Hence the anxiety of the governments of modern Europe to retain dominion over their colonies, and their attacks upon each other's colonies: hence, too, the Colonial System, as it is called; the system of trading monopolies, which took its rise in a mistaken desire in each nation to monopolize as much as possible of that trade between Europe and her colonies, which would have been more valuable to all the nations if it had been perfectly free. Let us distinguish between the existence and the dominion of a colony; between the existence and the monopoly of a colonial market. "There is no necessity," says Mr. Bentham, "for governing or possessing any island in order that we may sell merchandize there." But in order to sell merchandize in a colony, it is necessary that the colony should exist. If Mr. Bentham had drawn this distinction, if he had separated the question of dominion from the question of existence, he would not have been led, by dwelling on the evils of colonial monopoly, to undervalue the benefits of colonial trade. His

disciple, Mr. Mill, likewise, if he had drawn this distinction, would not have deprecated colonies because they have been made improperly a ground for jobs, monopolies and wars: he might have condemned the wars, monopolies and jobs, of which colonies have been the matter; but perceiving that the real source of those evils was, not the colonies, but the badness of European governments, he would probably have seen also, along with Adam Smith, the "natural advantages," which Europe has derived from her colonies, in spite of the tricks which those governments have played with them. The uses and abuses of colonization are very different things. While some philosophers have condemned colonization on account of its abuses, the nations of Europe, even when they promoted the abuses, had, one cannot say a knowledge, but a deep sense of the usefulness. That such "unscientific knowledge," to use terms employed by Bentham, should have been attended with very "unartificial practice," is just what might have been expected.

The objects of an old society in promoting colonization seem to be three; first, the extension of the market for disposing of their own surplus produce; secondly, relief from excessive numbers; thirdly, an enlargement of the field for employing capital. Referring, however, to a previous Note on the coincidence of overflowing national wealth

with the uneasiness and misery of individuals, it will be seen presently, that these three objects may come under one head; namely, an enlargement of the field for employing capital and labour. But, first, each object must be considered separately.

I. *The extension of markets.*

Why does any man ever produce of any thing more than he can himself consume? Solely because he expects that some other man will take from him that portion of the produce of his labour which he does not want, giving him in exchange something which he wants. From the power of exchanging comes every improvement in the application of labour, and every atom of the produce of labour, beyond that rude work and that small produce which supply the wants of savages. It is not because an English washerwoman cannot sit down to breakfast without tea and sugar, that the world has been circumnavigated; but it is because the world has been circumnavigated, that an English washerwoman requires tea and sugar for breakfast. According to the power of exchanging, are the desires of individuals and societies. But every increase of desires, or wants, has a tendency to supply the means of gratification. The savage hunter, enabled to exchange his furs for beads, is stimulated to greater energy and skill. The sole ground on which it is supposed that the blacks of the West Indies will work for wages as soon as they shall be set free, is their love of finery. They will produce sugar, it is said, in order to buy trinkets and fine clothes. And who ever worked hard, when was an improvement made in any useful art, save through the impulse of a passion for some kind of finery; for some gratification, not absolutely necessary, to be obtained by means of exchange? As with individuals, so with nations. In England, the greatest improvements have taken place continually, ever since colonization has continually produced new desires amongst the English, and new markets wherein to purchase the objects of desire. With the growth of sugar and tobacco in America, came the more skilful growth of corn in England. Because, in England, sugar was drank and tobacco smoked, corn was raised with less labour, by fewer hands; and more Englishmen existed to eat bread, as well as to drink sugar and smoke tobacco. The removal of Englishmen to America, and their industry in raising new productions not fit for the support of life, led, in England, to more production for the support of life. Because things not necessary had been produced, more necessaries were produced.*

* "Rich subjects make a rich nation. As the former increase, so will the means of filling the coffers of the latter. Let contemporary nations lay it to their account that England is more powerful than ever she was, notwithstanding her debt and

If the French should know how to colonize North Africa, they may overtake the English in the skilful application of domestic capital and labour; but if they do this, it will be through the impulse arising from new markets in which to sell the surplus produce of their industry. It thus appears, that the removal of people from an old society to

taxes. This knowledge should form an element in their foreign policy. Let them assure themselves that instead of declining she is advancing; that her population increases fast; that she is constantly seeking new fields of enterprise in other parts of the globe, and adding to the improvements that already cover her island at home, new ones that promise to go far beyond them in magnitude: in fine, that instead of being worn out, as at a distance is sometimes supposed, she is going a-head with the buoyant and vigorous effort of youth. * * * * Britain still exists all over the world in her colonies. These alone give her the means of advancing her industry and opulence for ages to come. They are portions of her territory more valuable than if joined to her island. The sense of distance is destroyed by her command of ships; whilst that very distance serves as the feeder of her commerce and marine. Situated on every continent, lying in every latitude, these, her out dominions, make her the centre of a trade already vast and perpetually augmenting,—a home trade and a foreign trade,—for it yields the riches of both as she controls it at her will. They take off her redundant population, *yet make her more populous*; and are destined under the policy already commenced towards them, and which in time she will more extensively pursue, to expand her empire, commercial, manufacturing and maritime, to dimensions to which it would not be easy to fix limits." *A Residence at the Court of London; by the Hon. Mr. Rush, Env. Ex. and Min. Plen. from the United States to England.*

a new place, may be of the greatest use to that old society, even when the people removed occupy themselves in raising objects of mere luxury, and when the mother country has yet many steps to make in the career of wealth and civilization.

But now comes the more interesting case of a society, which, stimulated by the extension of its markets, has cultivated all that part of its territory which is fit for cultivation; a society in which the utmost skill in the application of capital and labour to agriculture is counteracted by the necessity of cultivating inferior land; a society, consequently, in which food is dear, and in which there exist the strongest motives for importing food from other countries by means of manufactures and exchange; a society, in short, which requires new markets in which to purchase the staff of life. This is, pre-eminently, the case of England. Imagine a country, in which the quantity of air for breathing were limited, and were not more than sufficient to keep alive the actual number of its inhabitants; while of that actual number the larger portion by much obtained less than enough air; was half suffocated for want of air; in a state between life and death. Conceive farther, that in this country an inexhaustible supply of food might be obtained without labour, as air is every where obtained. Now suppose that this society should be able to obtain air from other countries by means of

manufactures and exchange. If this ability were allowed its free exercise, the population of that country would go on increasing continually, all the people being at ease, so long as the ability should last. But if the rulers of this country, having a property in the atmosphere, should forbid the people to get air from other countries, the bulk of that people must remain half suffocated, notwithstanding their natural ability to obtain plenty of the means of life. Substituting bread for air, this is the case of England with her stifling corn laws. The English corn laws will be repealed. As the present enquiry relates to a country like England but without corn laws, we may, for the sake of more ready illustration, speak of England as if her corn laws were repealed. When that shall happen, the English will hunt over the world in search of cheap corn. But where will they find any? Not in countries situated like England; not in any country where land is dear. They will find cheap corn, only in countries where land is cheap; in countries where the proportion which land bears to people is so great as, first, to render unnecessary the cultivation of inferior land, and, secondly, to encourage a large proportion of the people to occupy themselves with the growth of corn. But is not this the description of a colony, according to the sense in which the term colony is here used? a country having room for more people, with more

room at hand for the greatest increase of people. Poland is such a country; as was England when the bulk of Englishmen were serfs. But there are three reasons why such a country as England was then, is not the most fit to provide cheap corn for such a country as England is now: first, because in the then barbarous and despotic state of the English government, no dependence could have been placed on English industry for a regular supply of corn: secondly, because in the then barbarous condition of the English people, capital and labour were not applied to the growth of corn with that skill which renders the produce great in proportion to the hands employed: thirdly, because the savage ancestors of the English would not have cared to buy such objects as those, with which alone the English of this day could buy foreign corn. The market would have been very insecure; the corn brought to it not very cheap; and of that corn, whether cheap or dear, but a small quantity would have been brought to market. This is precisely the case of Poland, where the market is liable to be shut up by the whim of a tyrant; where the produce of agricultural capital and labour, though, by means of slavery, greater than it would be if the capital and labour were cut up into fractions as numerous as the cultivators, is much less than it would be if the same number of Poles should cultivate the same land with English skill; and where the

demand for English goods is by no means equal to the supply that could be afforded, nor likely to become so. Whereas in a colony planted by Englishmen, civilized and well governed, the highest skill in the application of capital and labour to the growth of corn, might conspire with great cheapness of land, to the raising of cheaper corn than has ever yet been raised; while so cheap a market for the purchase of corn would not only be as secure as any distant market ever was, but might be extended continually with the progress of colonization. Why such very cheap corn has not been raised in any English colony, is a different question, slightly noticed before;* and the means of raising very cheap corn in a colony, without slavery, will be carefully examined amongst the means of colonization. Here my object has been to show, that for such a country as England, a chief end of colonization is to obtain secure markets for the purchase of cheap corn; a steady supply of bread, liable to be increased with an increasing demand.

The trade which the English should conduct for obtaining cheap bread from their colonies might be of two kinds; direct and indirect. Supposing that very cheap corn were raised in Canada, the English might buy such corn with the manufactured goods of Leeds, Manchester

* See Note VII.

and Birmingham; this would be a direct trade. But it might very well happen, that the Canadians should be able to raise, not more corn than the English should be able to buy, but more than they should be able to buy *with manufactured goods*. In other words, the demand of the Canadians for English goods might be much less than the demand of the English for Canadian corn. But the Canadians would require many things, besides English goods, which are not producible in Canada: they would require tea and silver, for instance. The English, then, might, first buy tea and silver of the Chinese with manufactured goods, and then buy corn of the Canadians with tea and silver. But the demand, again, of the Chinese for English goods might not be sufficient to supply in this way the demand of the English for Canadian corn. For one thing, however, the demand of the Chinese is very urgent and would be without limit; for food in every shape; for the means of life. Here, then, is the groundwork of the most extensive commerce that ever existed in the world. Supposing that cheap food were raised in the English colonies of Australia, which, though far from England, are near to China, the English might buy such food with manufactured goods; with that food, buy tea and silver of the Chinese; and with that tea and silver, buy cheap corn of the Canadians. In this case, combination of capital and labour for division of

employments amongst four different nations, would be of the greatest service to all of them; to the Australian colonists, the Chinese, the Canadian colonists, and the English. A great number of cases like this might be reasonably supposed. From this case, which, though supposed, is very likely to occur, it will be seen that a colony, at the antipodes even of its mother country, might help to supply that mother country with cheap corn; and by means of the cheapness of land which is an attribute of colonies. Both by a direct and an indirect trade, colonies might, according to their number and extent, enlarge the field for employing capital and labour in the mother country; at home; without reference to the emigration of people or the removal of capital into distant fields of employment. The warmest imagination could hardly exaggerate the benefits which a country like England might derive from such enlargements of her domestic field of production; could hardly reckon at too much the new demand for labour at home, in building, machinery and manufactures; for the produce of domestic agriculture, corn alone excepted; for ships; for the use of mercantile capital; and for all kinds of services not usually called labour.

But, it may be said, a country like England, having no corn laws, might obtain all these benefits without colonies. "The possession of

colonies," Sir Henry Parnell would say, "affords no advantages which could not be obtained by commercial intercourse with independent states."* Here, again, the question of dominion is mixed up with the question of existence. Independent states! which are the independent states that could produce very cheap corn for the English market? The United States: truly; but the United States are as much colonies as were the never dependent colonies of Greece. Canada, on the other hand, being dependent, is neither more nor less fit than the United States to produce cheap corn for the English market. Let us banish altogether, for the present, the idea of monopoly or dominion. Of him who has done this, I would ask, What country, in which land is cheap, is most fit, on other accounts, to provide the English with cheap corn? Not Poland; because there property is insecure, industry unskilful and the people barbarous: not Buenos Ayres, where land is cheaper than in any other country, being obtainable in unlimited quantities for nothing, of the richest quality, already cleared and drained by nature; not Buenos Ayres, because the people of this colony are barbarously unskilful and have no desire for English goods: not Ceylon; because, though that country be improperly called an English colony, its inhabi-

* Financial Reform, page 251, 3d. edit.

tants are not anxious to obtain English goods: none of these, but the United States, Canada, and the English settlements in South Africa and Australia; because, in all of those countries, corn might be raised on cheap land, with English skill, by people anxious to buy English goods. If the English should buy cheap corn of the Canadians with Chinese tea and silver, it might be by means of selling English goods to the growers of cheap food in Australia. If cheap corn were brought to England, whether by the most straight and simple, or by the most round-about and complicated traffic, the original purchase-money of such corn must be manufactured goods, the produce of capital and labour employed in England; and it could be nothing else. Whence it follows, inevitably, that the number or extent of the markets, in which the English might buy very cheap corn, must depend upon the number or extent of countries raising cheap corn and requiring English goods. An English colony, whether dependent like Canada, or independent like the United States, might do both: it might both raise the corn and want the manufactured goods. We may conclude then, that with a view to the greatest market for buying cheap corn, a people like the English would plant or extend colonies; nations of Englishmen born, and their descendants; using the English language; preserving English skill and English tastes; and, therefore, both

able and willing to purchase English goods with cheap corn.

II. *Relief from excessive numbers.*

In modern times, no old country has ever obtained relief from excessive numbers by means of colonization. In no case, has the number of emigrants been sufficient to diminish, even for a year, the ruinous competition of labourers for employment; much less to produce any lasting improvement in the condition of the bulk of the people. More than once, however, this has been the object, or has been called the object, of an old state in promoting colonization. Twice since their late war with the French, the English have sent out bodies of people to colonies under the rule of the English government, for the declared purpose of checking pauperism at home: first to the Dutch colony of South Africa, and next to the English colony of Upper Canada. On neither of these occasions was the object attained even in the slightest degree. Both these attempts were called experiments. This year, the English government is making, to use the expression of Lord Goderich,* another "experiment" of the same kind, by providing the funds wherewith to convey to South Africa a number of destitute

* In a letter addressed to a society for the relief of orphan and destitute children.

children; the prodigious number of twenty. Considering that the population of England is fourteen millions, this experiment may be justly called child's play. The previous experiment in South Africa, and the outlay of 60,000*l.* in taking English paupers to Upper Canada, at the suggestion of Mr. (now Sir Robert) Wilmot Horton, and the Emigration Committees of the house of commons, were hardly less preposterous, if we are to believe that any benefit to the labouring class at home was seriously expected from them. To call experiments measures so futile, so obviously inadequate to the end in view, is an abuse of language; and one calculated to be mischievous; since, if these childish attempts had really been experiments, the signal failure of them would have been a fact tending to establish, that colonization with a view to relief from excessive numbers must necessarily fail of its object.

Two classes of men in England, classes of the most opposite turn of mind, have decided against colonization with this view; and on grounds equally unreasonable: first, those unreasoning men who would determine questions in political economy by quoting scripture; secondly, men, who possess in a high degree the faculty of reason, but who, having made a religion for themselves, are often under the influence of a kind of bigotry; I mean those political economists who worship capital. Speak of emigration to one of the former

class, and he will exclaim,—"Dwell in the land and verily ye shall be fed:" to one of the latter, and he will say,—The question deserves profound regard; but as employment for labour is in proportion to capital, as emigration would cost money and diminish capital, therefore it would diminish employment for labour and do more harm than good.

Whether right or wrong in their dislike of emigration, those who swear by David, and those who worship capital, are equally contradicted by facts. The people do dwell in the land, but verily they are not fed. Though no labour be employed save by capital, still millions upon millions of capital are accumulated, not to employ domestic labour, but, for want of employment *for capital*, either to lie idle, or to be wasted in distant and ruinous speculations. The quotation from scripture may be disposed of by another: "Increase and multiply, and *replenish the earth, and subdue it.*" But those who object to emigration on the score of its expense deserve, on account of their reputation and authority, that their argument should be carefully examined.

The argument is stated as follows, by Mr. Mill. "It has been often enough, and clearly enough explained, that it is capital which gives employment to labour: we may, therefore, take it as a postulate. A certain quantity of capital, then, is necessary to give employment to the population,

which any removal for the sake of colonization may leave behind. But *if*, to afford the expense of that removal, so much is taken from the capital of the country that the remainder is not sufficient for the employment of the remaining population, there is, in that case, a redundancy of population, and all the evils which it brings. For the well-being of the remaining population, a certain quantity of food is required, and a certain quantity of all those other things which minister to human happiness. But to raise this quantity of other things, a certain quantity of capital is indispensably necessary. *If* that quantity of capital is not supplied, the food and other things cannot be obtained."*

Though the argument stated thus hypothetically, thus guarded by *ifs*, amounts to the statement of a mere truism, still the "postulate" which runs through the argument is an assumption, that emigration *would* take away too much capital; so much as to leave too little for the remaining people. Mr. Bentham assumes this without any *ifs*. "Colonization," he says † "requires an immediate expense, an actual loss of wealth, for a future profit, for a contingent gain. The capital which is carried away for the improvement of the land in the colonies, had it been employed in the

* Article *Colony*. Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica.

† Rationale of Reward, B. 4, chap. 14.

mother-country, would have added to its increasing wealth, as well as to its population, and to the means of its defence, whilst, as to the produce of the colonies, only a small part ever reaches the mother-country. If colonization is a folly when employed as a means of enrichment, it is at least an agreeable folly."

Now upon what rests this assumption? It rests upon two other assumptions, one of which is true, the other false; first, that no labour is employed save by capital; secondly, that all capital employs labour. If it were true that every increase of capital necessarily gave employment to more labour; if it were true, as Professor M'Culloch has said,* that "there is plainly only one way of effectually improving the condition of the great majority of the community or of the labouring class, and that is *by increasing the ratio of capital to population*," then it might be assumed that colonization would, on account of its expense, do more harm than good. But it is not true that all capital employs labour. To say so, is to say that which a thousand facts prove to be untrue. Capital frequently increases without providing any more employment for labour. That this does actually happen in England, I have endeavoured to show elsewhere.† It follows, that capital, for

* Introductory Discourse, in his edition of the Wealth of Nations.

† Note IV.

which there is no employment at home, might be spent on emigration without diminishing employment for labour to the slightest extent. I use the word *spent* instead of *invested*, in order to save the trouble of explaining at length, that if capital so employed were utterly lost, that loss of capital need not diminish employment for labour. No one pretends that employment for English labour was diminished, to the extent of a single pair of hands, by the loans which the English lately made to the republics, so called, of South America, to the Spanish Cortes, to Don Miguel or Don Pedro; or by the late waste of English capital in pretending to work mines in South America, or in glutting distant markets with English goods, sold for less than the cost of production; or by the waste of English capital in founding the Swan River settlement. Still less has employment for English labour been diminished by late investments of English capital, in foreign countries, which yield some return; such as loans to the emperors of Austria and Russia, to the kings of Prussia, Naples, the Low Countries and France; purchases lately made in the securities of foreign governments, amounting at one time in the French funds alone to near 40,000,000*l.*; investments of English capital in the iron and cotton works of France, the Low Countries, and Germany; and finally, loans to the North American States. If all the capital removed from England in all these

ways during the last seventeen years, amounting to some hundreds of millions, had been lost in conducting emigration, employment for labour in England would not have been less than it is at present.

A recent fact illustrates this view of the subject still more forcibly. During the last year (1832), it is supposed, about 125,000 people, men women and children, emigrated from Britain to the United States, Canada and Australia. Of these a considerable number carried property with them, varying in amount from 5000*l.* to a few pounds over the cost of passage. The passage of the whole of them must have cost, at the lowest estimate of 5*l.* for each person, not less than 625,000*l.* Supposing that they took with them a capital of 5*l.* each, upon the average, which seems a very low estimate, emigration from Britain carried off during the last year a capital of 1,250,000*l.* Does any one pretend that this abstraction of capital has diminished, to the extent of a single pair of hands, the amount of employment for labour in Britain? Might we not rather expect, if England had no corn laws, that these 125,000 emigrants, employing their capital and labour in a wide and rich field, would create a new demand for the produce of capital and labour employed in Britain? Let these questions be answered carefully, and it will appear that much of the capital of such a country as England may be used in

promoting emigration, without diminishing, to say the least, the amount of employment for domestic labour. Whether capital might be so used with profit to the owners of it, whether, by such a use of capital, effectual relief from excessive numbers might be obtained, a requestions which belong rather to the means than to the ends of colonization. Here, my sole object is to show how groundless is the objection to emigration on the score of its expense; how futile is that *a priori* reasoning, by which some conclude, that the cost of emigration would necessarily diminish, according to its amount, the amount of employment for labour at home. I have dwelt so long on this objection, not with a view to recommend emigration by means of an outlay of English capital (for I shall endeavour to show hereafter that it would be greatly for the advantage of colonies to provide a fund for the immigration of labour), but in order to remove a prejudice against colonization, on the ground of the mischievous loss of capital which it might occasion to the mother-country; a prejudice, which stops him who entertains it, on the very threshold of this subject.*

* This prejudice was once entertained by Mr. Bentham. It depended upon a *non sequitur* which had got possession of his mind. In the fourth book of the Rationale of Reward, M. Dumont has a chapter entitled "Bentham and Adam Smith," where he draws a comparison between the views of political economy,

Supposing that, whether by means of English capital about, at all events, to fly off to foreign

taken by the English and Scotch philosophers. "Mr. Bentham," he says, "has simplified his subject, by referring every thing to one principle; namely *the limitation of production and trade by the limitation of capital*; a principle which brings all his reasonings into a very small circle, and which serves to unite into one bundle those observations, which cannot be so easily grasped when they are disunited." This one principle is stated as follows in the first paragraph of Bentham's *Manual of Political Economy*. "No kind of productive labour of any importance can be carried on without capital. From hence it follows, that the quantity of labour applicable to any object, is limited by the quantity of capital which can be employed in it." Doubtless; but then the principle is, "the limitation of production and trade by the limitation of capital" *for which there is employment*. The words which I have added, in italics, make all the difference. It does not follow that, because labour is employed by capital, capital always finds a field in which to employ labour. This is the *non sequitur* always taken for granted by Bentham, Ricardo, Mill, M'Culloch, and others. Adam Smith, on the contrary, saw that there were limits to the employment of capital, and therefore limits, besides the limit of capital, to the employment of labour; the limits, namely, of the field of production, and of the market in which to dispose of surplus produce. During the summer of 1831, Mr. Bentham's attention was called to this subject. At first he urged the objection to colonization which has been here examined, but finally abandoned it. Then, immediately, notwithstanding his great age and bodily infirmities, he proceeded to study the whole subject of colonization, and even to write upon it at some length. His written remarks upon the subject, now in my possession, show that he lived to consider colonization, not "an agreeable folly,"

countries, or by means of a fund raised in the colonies, such an amount of labour should emigrate from England as considerably to diminish the proportion which, in England, labour bears to employment, then would the wages of labour be higher, then would the state of the bulk of the people be improved, then would relief be obtained from excessive numbers. This great end of colonization has never been so much as seriously contemplated by the ruling class in England. On the contrary, taught by certain economists to believe, that profits rise when wages fall, and fall when wages rise, that the prosperity of the capitalist is consistent only with the misery of the labourer, the late ruling class in England would have set their faces against any project of colonization which had seemed fit to raise wages. Late events have produced some change of feeling on this subject; and coming events, probably, will soon produce a greater change. "What," says Mr. Mill, "is felt as disagreeable by the *great men*, is sure never to continue long without an effort, either wise or foolish, for the removal of it." The new ruling class of England, those whom late events have made the great men of England, are placed in a situation which may render excess of numbers highly disagreeable to

but a work of the greatest utility. I am proud to add, that the form of the present treatise was suggested by one of the wisest and best of mankind.

them. They may be glad to pay high wages for the security of their property; to prevent the devastation of England through commotions arising from discontent in the bulk of the people. Even before the late change, while the fears of the great men were urging them to bring about that change, while fires were blazing and mobs exacting higher wages in the south of England, a dread of the political evils likely to come from excessive numbers, induced the English government to form a Board of Emigration, with the avowed purpose of improving the condition of the labouring class, by removing some of them to the colonies. A more foolish, or rather futile, effort by great men to remove what they felt as disagreeable, was, perhaps never made; but the effort, feeble and puerile though it were, tends to point out that for a country situated like England, in which the ruling and the subject orders are no longer separated by a middle class, and in which the subject order, composing the bulk of the people, are in a state of gloomy discontent arising from excessive numbers; that for such a country, one chief end of colonization is to prevent tumults, to keep the peace, to maintain order, to uphold confidence in the security of property, to hinder interruptions of the regular course of industry and trade, to avert the terrible evils which, in a country like England,

could not but follow any serious political convulsion.

For England, another end of colonization, by means of relief from excessive numbers, would be relief from that portion of the poor's-rate which maintains workmen in total or partial idleness; an object in which the ruling order have an obvious interest.

For England again, a very useful end of colonization would be to turn the tide of Irish emigration from England to her colonies; not to mention that the owners of land in Ireland, most of them being foreigners by religion, might thus be taken out of the dilemma in which they are now placed; that of a choice between legally giving up a great part of their rental to the hungry people, and yielding to the people's violence the land which was taken by violence from their fathers.

Finally, comprised in relief from excessive numbers is the relief to many classes, not called labourers or capitalists, from that excessive competition for employment which renders them uneasy and dissatisfied. Of the 125,000 persons who quitted England last year to settle in colonies, not a few were professional men; surgeons, clergymen, lawyers, architects, engineers, surveyors, teachers and clerks: some few of them were governesses. It will be seen, when we shall

come to the means of colonization, that, if colonies were properly managed, they would furnish, according to the continual progress in their number or extent, a continually increasing demand for the services of all those classes.

III. *Enlargement of the field for employing capital.*

This end of colonization is distinct from that enlargement of the field for employing capital, which would come by the creation of extensive markets for the purchase of cheap corn with the produce of domestic industry. It may be best explained by reference to some facts. Since England began to colonize, how many Englishmen have quitted their country with small fortunes, and returned with large ones, made by means of high profits in the colonies! In the West India islands, alone, millions upon millions of English capital have been employed with very great profit; millions upon millions, which, we may be sure, would not have been removed to the West Indies, if they could have been invested at home with equal profit. An existing London Company has more than doubled its capital in a few years, besides paying a handsome dividend to the shareholders, by the purchase and sale of waste land in Upper Canada. In 1829, the Dutch firm of Crommelin, of Amsterdam, advanced 1,500,000 dollars to some colonists in America,

for the purpose of making a canal. This money is securely invested, and yields a higher interest or profit, than it would have done had it remained in Holland; a country in which, as in England, capital appears to increase faster than the field of production. The loan lately made by the London house of Baring Brothers, to the state of Louisiana, is a secure and profitable investment of English capital in the improvement of a colony. While I write, the firm of Thomas Wilson and Co. is negociating in London a loan of 3,500,000 dollars to the state of Alabama. One condition of this loan, evidently devised to tempt the capitalists of London, is, that the lenders shall not be paid off for thirty years. Examples without end might be adduced of profitable investments made by the people of old states in new colonies; and made, too, without any permanent abstraction of capital from the old country. That great masses of English capital have been wasted in colonies, is also true. Of such a case, the absurd proceedings of the London *Australian Agricultural Company*, and the capital wasted in founding the Swan River settlement, are good examples. But those sums were as well wasted in that way, as if they had been lent to Don Miguel or Don Pedro. To say that because English capital has been wasted in colonies, no more capital ought to be invested in that way, would be like saying, that because Waterloo bridge yields no profit to those

who built it, no more bridges ought to be built. How English capital might be securely invested in colonies without loss, with certain profit; what would be the most secure and profitable mode of investing English capital in colonies; these are questions which belong to the next division of this subject. Here it is sufficient to have shown by the above examples, that colonies may open a rich and wide field for employing that capital of a mother country, for which there is no very profitable employment at home.

All these ends of colonization, the extension of markets, relief in several ways from excessive numbers, and new investments for capital, may now be brought under one head; namely, a progressive enlargement, partly domestic, and partly colonial, of the field for employing capital and labour. The vast importance of this object, to a country situated like England, is more fully explained in some of the foregoing notes.

THE ENDS OF COLONIZATION, AS RESPECTS THE COLONY.

The United States are still colonies, according to the sense in which the word is used here. They receive people from old states, and send out a much greater number of people to settle in new places. For promoting the immigration of capital and people, the motive of these states seems to be precisely opposite to that of an old country in

promoting the emigration of capital and people. The old country wants an enlargement of its field for employing capital and labour: the colonies want more capital and labour for cultivating an unlimited field. By pouring capital and labour into England, you would augment the competition and uneasiness of capitalists, as well as the competition and misery of labourers: by pouring capital and labour into America, you would increase the wealth and greatness of that great colony. By pouring labour only into England, you would not increase the capital of that country, because the increase of labour would not find employment; but, as labour creates capital before capital employs labour, and as, in America, there is capital enough for the employment of more labour and room for the employment of more capital, therefore, by pouring labour only into America, you would provide more capital for the employment of still more labour. It follows, that colonies situated like the United States, colonies, that is, which already possess more capital than labour, have a greater interest in obtaining labour than in obtaining capital from old countries: just as a country situated like England, has a greater interest in procuring relief from excessive numbers than from the competition of capital with capital. As the main object of an old country in promoting emigration is to send forth continually all that portion of the

constantly increasing labouring class for which there is not employment with good wages, so the main object of a colony in promoting the immigration of people is to obtain as much labour as can find employment with good wages. A like difference of objects occurs with respect to new markets, and especially to those in which corn should be bought or sold. The object of the colony is to buy manufactured goods with raw produce and corn; that of the old country to buy raw produce and corn with manufactured goods: the object of the colony is to obtain more labour, wherewith to raise the means of buying manufactured goods; that of the old country to obtain cheap corn, wherewith to support more labourers at home. But, though two persons in different places cannot meet without proceeding in opposite directions; though, if they intend to meet, the object of one is to go in one direction and the object of the other to go in an opposite direction; still they have a common object, that of meeting. Just so in colonization, though the immediate object of an old state be to send out people, and that of a colony to receive people, though the colony want to sell, and the old country want to buy, the means of life; still they have a common object, that of increasing the number and enjoyments of mankind. Their common object is to give full play to the principle of population, so

long as any habitable part of the colony remains uninhabited.

This community of interest becomes still more plain, when we reflect on the object of a colony in removing people from the settled to the waste parts of the colony. Here the immediate object of the colony is the very same as that of the mother country; an enlargement of the general field of production in proportion to the general increase of capital and labour. The object of the old country is, that room should be made for more people; that of the colony to make room for more people. These truisms are repeated, because it will be useful to bear them in mind when we shall come to the means of colonization; and because, hitherto, those who have had the means of colonization at their disposal would seem never to have heard of these mere truisms.

With a view also to saving time when we shall come to the means of colonization, it will be well to notice here, in a more particular way, some of the special objects of a colony in promoting the immigration of people.

I have attempted to prove elsewhere, that want of free labour is the cause of slavery in America; not the dearness of labour, but the want of free labour at any price. Why do the settlers in New South Wales, having capital, dread above all things that the English government should cease

to pour into that colony a stream of population utterly depraved and irreclaimable? The criminal code of England is more bloody than that of any other country which has a code of laws; but in New South Wales, the proportion of public executions to public executions in England is, I believe, allowing for the difference of numbers, in the ratio of 325 to 1. This is partly accounted for when we reflect, that, of the convicts sent to New South Wales, nine out of ten are men, brought to that pass, most of them, by the violence of their passions; nine men to one woman; men accustomed to unbridled indulgence and reckless of all social ties. The result need not be described. Nor is it difficult to account for the attachment of the English government to this system of Reformation. If English convicts were punished by imprisonment at home, though the English aristocracy would have, to bestow upon their dependants, more places, such as that of jailer or turnkey, they would miss the disposal of a number of places such as gentlemen will accept. The governor of New South Wales is a jailer; but, being called Your Excellency, and paid accordingly, he is thankful for his place; as thankful as any one ever is for a place which he has obtained by electioneering services. But how are we to account for the attachment of the richer colonists to this horrid system of transportation? By their want of free labour; by their anxiety to keep

that slave labour, without which each of them could use no more capital than his own hands could employ. They say, and with perfect truth, that if the supply of convicts were stopped the colony would be ruined. Assuredly the colony would be ruined, unless the richer settlers should find the means of obtaining either free labour, or that kind of slave labour which they have in America.

But even with the convict system, there is a deficiency of labour. In Van Diemen's Land, it is common to see one, two or three, thousand sheep all in one flock, the old and the young, the strong and the weak, all mixed together. While feeding, the strongest of a flock, so mixed, always take the van, the weakest always bringing up the rear. Thus a great number of the lambs or weaker sheep are starved to death; and, of course, the profits of the owner of the flock are by so much diminished. Why is this loss incurred? for want of more shepherds; of more labour. If there were in Van Diemen's Land shepherds enough to manage all the flocks in the best way, the increase of produce would give higher wages to the greater number of labourers, besides augmenting the profits of the flock owners. The soil and climate of New South Wales appear admirably suited to the growth of tobacco, olive oil, silk and wine. A London company has spent near 300,000*l.* with the intention, declared by its prospectus, of growing all these things in New South Wales. Why has it not grown any of these things? Because for the growth of any of these things constant and combined labour is required; an element of production wanting in New South Wales. Convict labour, though constant when compared with such labour as is got by the occasional immigration of free workmen, is very inconstant when compared with the labour of negro slaves. The convict works only so long as his term of punishment lasts, and for one master only so long as the governor pleases, or the secretary of the governor, or the superintendent of convicts, or some member of the colonial council; any one of whom may suddenly, and without rhyme or reason, deprive a settler of his convict servants. While slave labour may be combined in quantities proportioned to the capitalist's means of buying slaves, convict labour can never be combined in large quantities; because, as the government bestows this labour, if any one settler should obtain more than his due share of convicts, all the others would complain of gross partiality; and because the proportion of convicts to settlers is so small, that without gross partiality no one settler can have more than a few pairs of convict hands. Favoured settlers, those who find favour with the governor and his officers, do often obtain more than a fair share of convicts; but, as the favour of governors is uncertain, no motive

is furnished, even in these cases of gross partiality, for the commencement of works which require the constant employment of many hands, at the same time, in the same place, and for a period of consecutive years. How, says Mr. Blaxland, a great land proprietor of New South Wales; how should our settlers undertake to plant vineyards, when years must pass before any wine could be got; years during which much labour must be employed in tending the vines; when, for gathering the grapes and turning them into wine, much more labour would be required; and when, in this colony, the supply of labour is always, not only small, but uncertain?* This is why the Australian Agricultural company has not raised any exchangeable produce; save wool, which in a country like New South Wales, naturally clear and dry, may be raised with very little labour: this is why the greater part of the 300,000*l.* spent by that company has been utterly wasted; is gone to nothing.

Why has so much of the capital perished, that was taken to the Swan River? for want of labour wherewith to preserve it. Why do the few settlers that remain in that colony wish for a supply of convict labour? because they have no free labour.

In Canada, as in the United States, there is a

* I quote from recollection of a paper, printed by Mr. Wilmot Horton, containing Minutes of a Conversation between himself and Mr. Blaxland.

want of free labour for works which require the combination of many hands and division of employments. The canals which the English government has lately formed in Canada could not have been finished, or perhaps begun, without a supply of labour from Ireland. The great Lake Erie canal, a work of which the public advantage, and the profit to the undertakers, was made manifest upon paper long before the work was begun, could not perhaps have been begun, most certainly could not have been finished, without a great supply of Irish labour. Capital from Amsterdam and London, and labour from Ireland, have, lately, been of infinite service to the United States. Theirs is the most favorable case. In all the more favorable cases, the difficulty is for masters to get servants. In the less favorable cases, such as Buenos Ayres and the Swan River, the difficulty would be for servants to find masters. In the worst cases, want of labour leads to want of capital, and condemns the people to a state of poverty and barbarism: in the best cases, the people would be more wealthy, would produce and enjoy more, if they were more numerous in proportion to capital. All the more favorable cases are maintained by some expedient, which more or less counteracts the want of labour; in the United States by slavery and the immigration of people; in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land by the convict system; in Canada

by a constant immigration of labour by sea, greater than ever took place before in the history of colonization. If the means by which the United States, Canada and New South Wales, obtain labour, should be taken away, no others being supplied, then must those colonies soon fall into the miserable state of other colonies which have never had any means of obtaining labour. In a word, from whatever point of view we look at this subject, it appears that the great want of colonies is Labour, the original purchase-money of all things.

THE MEANS OF COLONIZATION.

The elements of colonization, it is quite obvious, are waste land and the removal of people. If there were no waste land, no people would remove; if no people would remove, waste land must remain in a desert state. Waste land is cultivated by the removal of people, and people are removed by means of the motive to removal furnished by the existence of waste land. Capital for the removal of people, and for the settlement of people on waste land, being included in the ideas of removal and settlement, the means of colonization, it follows inevitably, will resolve themselves into the disposal of waste land for the removal of people. A notice of some facts will illustrate this proposition.

The moving power for founding the first English

colony in America, that did not perish, was a grant by James I., to the *London Company*, of five degrees of waste land in Virginia. The power of the king to dispose of waste land induced the company to form the project of founding a colony: the power thus obtained by the company to dispose of waste land, enabled them to find people willing to emigrate, and capital for their removal and settlement. Just so, in the case of the last colony founded by England, those who founded the colony were induced to remove by receiving grants of waste land from the English government. Mr. Peel's motive for removing to the Swan River with a capital of 50,000*l.* and some hundred people, was a grant of 500,000 acres of waste land; and the motive with which those people accompanied him was the hope of high wages for cultivating waste land, or the prospect of obtaining waste land of their own. So also, last year, when an English company offered Lord Goderich 125,000*l.* for 500,000 acres of land at Spencer's Gulph on the south coast of Australia, intending to lay out 375,000*l.* more in planting a colony on that desert spot, the motive of those projectors was to obtain waste land. Of the 125,000 people, who are supposed to have emigrated from Britain last year to settle in the United States, Canada and Australia, the greater number were induced to remove by the prospect of obtaining waste land, and the remainer by a prospect of benefits

to result to them from the disposal of waste land in the countries where they should settle. The greatest emigration of people that ever took place in the world occurs from the eastern states to the outside of the western states of America; and here the sole object in removing is either to obtain waste land, or to reap benefits in some other shape from the late disposal of waste land. It seems needless to multiply such examples.

The disposal of waste land for the removal of people might be considered in two different points of view; first, as that element of colonization is liable to be used by an old state; and secondly, as it is liable to be used by a colony. Both these ways of examining the subject would lead to the same conclusion. For instance, we should determine the best mode of treating waste land, either by ascertaining how the United States might best dispose of waste land for the removal of people, or how the English, with the same object, might best dispose of waste land in Canada or Australia. But considering that the removal of people is a secondary means of colonization, depending on the disposal of waste land; seeing that it is waste land which draws people from the settled to the waste parts of the colony, and so makes room for the arrival of people from an old country, and that this prime mover, or point of attraction, exists in the colony, it will be found much more convenient to look at the

means of colonization from a colonial position. If this course had been pursued before, the English would not have been as ignorant as they are of the political economy of new countries. Their economists, in treating of colonies, have worked with no other tools than those which they were accustomed to use in explaining the phenomena of an old country; have reasoned from principles, that were true in the old country, to facts that never existed in the colony. They remind one of an Englishman who, having been used to the luxury of music, carried a grand upright piano to the Swan River, and then, finding no body to make a cupboard for him, was fain to gut the musical instrument and use it for holding his crockery; or of that English colonial minister, who, knowing that in Europe the seas are salt, sent water butts from England for the use of the English fleet on a fresh water sea in America. By looking at this subject from a colonial position, we shall proceed from facts to conclusions. Whatever course it would be best for the United States to pursue for drawing people from England to America, would be the best course that the English could pursue for sending people to Canada or Australia. Having ascertained what this best course is, it will be easy to apply our conclusions to the foundation of colonies; and to show how an old state might best co-operate with a colony for giving to the

means of colonization their greatest possible effect.

I. *The disposal of waste land.*

It is not because land is uncultivated, nor even because it is uninhabited, that it forms an element of colonization. The greater part of Prince Edward's Island, in the Gulph of St. Lawrence, though neither cultivated nor inhabited, still, being the private property of two English lords,* is not liable to be used for the removal of people: nor, indeed, is any land, to which no government can give a title of possession; since the motive for removing to waste land is the prospect of obtaining a property in the land. Considering how much land in America, South Africa and Australia, is open to be used by individuals without a title to the possession of it, it would be surprising that so few people should ever have used land without a title, if we did not reflect, also, on the influence of that "charm of property," which, says M. Dumont, "is the spur of youth and pillow of old age." Those Americans, who, under the name of *squatters*, use land without a title are exceptions to the general rule. Their motives for acting differently from people in general will be noticed hereafter. But while, speaking generally, people will not use land without a title,

* Melville and Westmoreland.

they will obtain a title to land without using their property, or to more land than they can possibly use. The English company which founded Virginia would have preferred a grant of all America to a grant of five degrees. Lower Canada is not the only English colony in which English lords have obtained great tracts of land, without using, or even intending to use, their property. An Englishman, calling himself the Earl of Stirling, lately took much pains to make out a property in all the land of Upper Canada. The clergy of the political church in Upper Canada have obtained a property in vast tracts of land which they cannot use. General Lafayette lately accepted from the United States 300,000 acres of waste land which he cannot or will not use. In 1824, *the Australian Agricultural Company* and the *Van Diemen's Land Company*, both of London, obtained, the one, 1,000,000, the other, 500,000 acres of waste land, when it was impossible they should turn a fourth part of those great tracts to any useful purpose. The first immigrants to the Swan River obtained more land than a thousand times as many people could have cultivated. In all these cases, and in a countless number more, so much of the chief element, of the primary means, of colonization was annihilated. Nay, further, in most of them, the destruction was extended for a time to land that was not granted; as for instance, at the Swan River,

where a broad stripe of the coast, not being used, being almost without inhabitants and quite without roads, became, when it became the property of individuals, a bar to the disposal of land more in the interior; land which, if the coast were inhabited and easily passable, might be disposed of for the removal of people. For the same reason, General Lafayette has been requested to sell his grant to people who will use it; because, that is, being at once desert and private property, it is a bar to the progress of settlement in all directions towards its centre. This, again, is the case with the lands of the clergy in Canada; and with a still more absurd kind of property created in that colony; namely, tracts of land "reserved" by the crown in the midst of land which has become the property of individuals. In this last case, the government behaves worse than the dog in the manger, who only prevented others from using that which he could not use himself. Besides doing this, the government of Canada injures all the people who surround its reserves of land, by interposing deserts amongst them: it is as if the dog had bitten the cattle, besides hindering them from eating the hay. As flour is an element of bread, so is waste land an element of colonization; but as flour, which has been turned into pie-crust, will not make bread, so neither is waste land, which has become private property, an element of colonization. It is the disposal of waste land in

a certain way, which is the primary means of colonization; and when the land has been disposed of in another way, the power to dispose of it in the right way no longer exists. Land, to be an element of colonization, must not only be waste, but it must be public property, liable to be converted into private property for the end in view. In the art of colonization, therefore, the first rule is of a negative kind: it is, that governments, having power over waste land, and seeking to promote the removal of people, should never throw away any of that power; should never dispose of waste land except for the object in view, for the removal of people, for the greatest progress of colonization.

This rule has never been strictly observed by any colonizing government: it has been grossly neglected by all such governments, excepting only the United States, which, since they became entirely independent, have been more cautious than any other colonizing government ever was about the disposal of waste land. One or two examples of this neglect, and this caution, will assist us in determining in what way a government ought to dispose of waste land with a view to colonization.

The most striking instance of the neglect of this rule has occurred in the Dutch colony of South Africa. Here, we are informed by Mr. Barrow, in the account of his travels through that

colony, the colonial government, having absolute controul over all the land in the country, disposed of that land in the following way. They first declared, that any one desirous to obtain land should be at liberty to do so on one condition; namely, that of taking a hundred times, at least, more land than he could possibly cultivate. The whole district to be granted was marked out in circles, the diameter of each circle being some miles; and any one who undertook to live in the centre of one of those circles obtained a title to all the land within the circle. What became of the land between the circles is not stated; but all these interstices must necessarily have been so many "crown reserves." The object of this system was to separate those who should become proprietors; to separate them, all from each other, by a distance equal to the diameter of the circles; and the motive for this object was fear lest, if the colonists were not so separated, they might, as union is force, be strong enough to think of self-government. This object was fully acomplished, and the colony was effectually ruined. All the land so granted, though scarcely inhabited, still less cultivated, ceased, by this manner of disposing of it, to be an element of colonization. That such a disposal of the land had no tendency to promote the removal of people, save only that of the few persons thus scattered over the colony, becomes plain when we reflect, that there can be

but one motive for emigrating to a place where all the land has become private property, namely, the hope of obtaining high wages; and that a few scattered settlers were necessarily prevented, even by their dispersion, from accumulating capital wherewith to pay high wages to immigrant labourers. If they had not obtained some slaves, that is some combination of labour in the particular works of their farms, they would, being so scattered and prevented from combining their own labour, have degenerated into the state of those savage descendants of Spaniards, who inhabit the plains of Buenos Ayres. As it was, a more ignorant and brutal race of men than the boors or farmers of South Africa never, perhaps, existed. The poverty and barbarism of that country, the unfitness of the greater part of it for the work of colonization, are owing, not, as has been supposed for the want of a better reason, to the badness of its soil and climate, (for these very much resemble those of Spain) but to the neglect by its early governments of the first rule in the art of colonization.*

* "The white population at present (1828) is estimated at about 70,000. In 1806, it was not more than 27,000. From a variety of causes, some permanent, others accidental, *they have been scattered over a larger space than was consistent with mutual aid and support.* This retarded the progressive division of labour, and exposed the solitary settler to many dangers and privations, which did not operate beneficially on

If the first Dutch governor of New York had been able, he would probably have been willing,

his habits of industry. Instead of trying how much produce of every kind they could raise, they were rather led to consider on how little they could subsist. The limits of the settlement being, perhaps too rapidly extended, rendered defence, rather than cultivation, the chief object of public attention. It is not meant that the settlers should have been crowded together. The nature of the colony rendered that impossible. But for some time no moderation was observed in this respect; and a *great waste* of capital, and *misapplication of labour and strength*, were the consequence. The increase of population, provided the boundaries be now fixed and adhered to, will gradually correct this evil, and bring *both labour and a market more and more within the reach of the farmer.* If these views of the colony be near the truth, it will be worth considering whether, when new settlers are to be provided for, it would not be better to select locations for them in detail, as near the villages,and Cape Town, as these can be found, than to set them down in masses by themselves on the outskirts of the colony or beyond its peopled limits. In such situations they are not merely useless, but a burthen, to the community for many years—requiring new and expensive establishments for their protection, besides *wasting their own money in fruitless undertakings*, begun from mere ignorance of the resources of the country. There appears to be *abundance* of unappropriated land, or at least of unoccupied, or at all events, of uncultivated land, *in most of the settled districts*, on which many thousands of industrious people might be placed, most advantageously to the old inhabitants, and with much surer prospect of providing for themselves and their families all the necessaries of life, than *in the remote places to which the stream of emigration is too often directed.* It is true, the best places in those districts have fallen to the lot of the first settlers. But locations of the second, third, or *fourth* qua-

enough, to ruin that colony by planting each of the first settlers in the centre of a circle nine or twelve miles round; but here, fortunately, the warlike temper of the natives, and the extreme denseness of the forests, made it impossible to execute such a contrivance for ruining the colony. Though, in this case, the first settlers were allowed to appropriate much more land than they could possibly use, still they were allowed to settle whercabouts they pleased. In fear of the natives, and checked by the density of the forests, they settled not very far from each other, and were thus enabled to hold some intercourse with each other, to assist each other in some degree, to accumulate some capital, to preserve in some degree the arts and civilization of their mother-country. In this case, circumstances independent of the government, created a sort of rule for the disposal of waste land. This case is not, therefore, an example of attention in a government to the first rule in the art of colonization: it is mentioned by way of contrast with the pre-

lity, as regards soil, &c. near a good road or a town, may exceed in value, *a thousand fold*, those of the *first* description which possess no such advantages." Extract from the *South African Commercial Advertizer*; a Journal conducted by an Englishman of great intelligence and ability; a political economist too, who, until he *saw* a new country, would have commenced an explanation of the English theory of rent, saying with Mr. Mill—"Land is of different degrees of fertility."

ceding case; a contrast the more remarkable, since the miserable colony of South Africa, and the prosperous colony of New York, were founded by the same industrious, skilful and thrifty nation.

Two examples of some caution on the part of colonial governments in disposing of waste land may now be cited, in contrast with examples of reckless profusion.

1. Up to the year 1822, thirty-four years after the first settlement in New South Wales, and when the prosperity of the free settlers in that colony was a subject of great admiration in England, the quantity of waste land disposed of by the government was 381,466 acres; less than the one grant obtained by Mr. Peel before he left England for the Swan River. Shortly afterwards, Lord Bathurst, the English colonial minister, living in London, and knowing as much about New South Wales as about Japan or the moon, disposed of a million of acres in a single grant. In one day, then, twice as much land was granted as had been granted in thirty-four years. Up to 1822, all the land in New South Wales, except less than 400,000 acres, was liable to be disposed of as a means of colonization. In 1828, when the population of the colony was little more than in 1822, the number of acres rendered not liable to be disposed of for the removal of people, was nearly 3,000,000. That the greater part of this

land was not used by any one, appears from an official return, which states that only a forty-first part of it, or 71,523 acres, was cultivated. Allowing for the very slight interference with nature, which is termed cultivation in New South Wales, and for the turn of colonial governments to exaggerate the prosperity of the people ruled by them, we may perhaps conclude, that not so much as a forty-first part of these 3,000,000 acres was used beneficially. If so, in 1828, more than forty parts out of forty-one, of the land granted by the government of New South Wales, had been disposed of so as to render them no longer an element of colonization, without rendering them useful to any other purpose. The profusion of the government after 1822, arose from the publication of Mr. Wentworth's book on New South Wales. Mr. Wentworth informed people in England, that land in New South Wales was worth something; that of the 400,000 acres then granted, thousands of acres, being near to a market, yielded rent; that an estate in New South Wales was a good thing to have, especially if it could be got for nothing. All at once, the colonial office in London was besieged by applicants wanting land in New South Wales. What way so easy of gratifying a friend of government, or the friends and relatives of the friends and members of government? Immense grants, accordingly, were made; some, indeed, to peo-

ple who emigrated, but some to lords and members of parliament who never thought of emigrating. In this way, the colony would have been ruined, but for the peculiar circumstances before alluded to, which supply the colonists with labour, keep them together, and provide them with a market.

2. Between the modes of granting land on the Canadian and American sides of the line, which divides Upper Canada from the state of New York, there has existed until lately a very remarkable contrast. On the Canadian side, crown and clergy "reserves;" unconditional grants of vast tracts to any one who could find favour with the English minister or colonial governor; grants of smaller tracts, but still without conditions, to disbanded soldiers, military pensioners and pauper immigrants; in a word, the greatest profusion: on the American side, a system, nearly fixed and uniform, one general and unvarying rule, with few exceptions, for the granting of land; an act of congress, which decrees that no waste land shall be disposed of except by a special grant of congress, or upon payment by the grantee to the government of a dollar and a quarter per acre. The special grants by congress are few and far between; while the price put upon all other waste land operates as a check, almost as a bar, to the appropriation of land by persons not able, or not willing, to use their property. Mr. Stuart, after describing various marks of industry and growing wealth on the American side of the line, says: "We crossed the river * * * * * The country we passed through (on the Canadian side) was greatly over-cropped, with little appearance of industry or exertion to reclaim it. Whenever the stage stopped to water the horses, the doors were crowded with children, offering apples and plums for sale; and we saw, for the first time on this side of the Atlantic, several beggars."* The following account, of the difference between the American and Canadian sides of the line, in point of industry and wealth, is given by Mr. Pickering; a careful observer, with strong prejudices against the Americans. "I am once again under the jurisdiction of the British government and laws, and therefore feel myself no longer an alien. Though the Americans, in general, are civil and friendly, still an Englishman, himself a stranger amongst them, is annoyed and disgusted by their vaunts of prowess in the late puny war, and superiority over all other nations; and they assume it as a self-evi-

* "I never observed land more in want of manure than this part of Canada (near Montreal) originally of indifferent soil, and now *totally worn out by over-cropping*, and in the most wretched state of agriculture. Yet the manure in a great stable yard, belonging to the hotel where we lodged, is thrown into the river; and obviously little use is made of it *any where*." *Stuart*, vol. 1, p. 163.

dent fact, that the Americans surpass all others in virtue, wisdom, valour, liberty, government, and every other excellence. Yet, much as the Americans deserve ridicule for this foible, still I admire the energy and enterprise every where exhibited, and regret the apathy of the British government with regard to the improvement of this province. A single glance down the banks of the Niagara tells on which side the most efficient government has resided. On the United States side, large towns springing up; the numerous shipping, with piers to protect them in harbour; coaches rattling along the road; and trade evidenced by waggons, carts, horses, and people on foot, in various directions. On the Canadian side, although in the immediate vicinity, an *older settlement*, and apparently *better land*, there are only two or three stores, a tavern or two, a natural harbour without piers, but few vessels, and two temporary landing places."*

To what is owing this striking difference between the prosperity of two sets of people, cultivating the same soil, under the same climate, with the same degree of knowledge, and divided only by an imaginary line? What has caused the second emigration into the state of New York of a large proportion of the poorer emigrants from Britain to Upper Canada? These questions

* Emigrant's Guide to Canada, 1830.

will be answered presently. Meanwhile, enough has been stated to show, that there must be some one way better than all the others of treating waste land for the removal of people, for the greatest progress of colonization; and that every disposal of waste land in any way but the best way diminishes by so much the power of a colonizing state to proceed in the best way.

What is the best way in which to dispose of waste land with a view to colonization? It may be supposed, that in some one colony, at least, for some short time, this best way of proceeding has been adopted, if only by accident. On the contrary, as far as I can learn, in no one colony of modern times, has any uniform system been adopted even for a week: while in nearly all colonies several ways of proceeding, the most different and often contradictory, have been pursued either within a short period or at the same time.

The nearest approach to an uniform system is that of the United States; the sale of waste land by public auction at a fixed upset price, except as to special grants by congress. The exceptions, however, are so important as to defeat the rule. Amongst these exceptions are the grant of 300,000 acres to General Lafayette; grants to the amount of 6,528,000 acres to disbanded soldiers,* and

* "The great Military Bounty tract, reserved by Congress

enormous grants for the support of schools and colleges, as well as to the undertakers of public works, such as roads and canals. All these grants so far resemble the crown and clergy reserves of Upper Canada, that they have diminished, according to their extent, the field of colonization, and injured the settlers round about those special grants. For neither the French general, nor the disbanded soldiers, nor the schools and colleges, nor the undertakers of canals, attempted to cultivate the land which they so obtained for nothing. But General Lafayette may sell his land for less than the minimum price per acre required by congress from all buyers of waste land. This the disbanded soldiers have actually done:* thus counteracting whatever may have been the object of congress in adopting that price. In several ways, therefore, the special grants by congress are, not merely in exception, but in

for distribution among the soldiers of the late war, commences in the neighbourhood of Lower Alton. It comprehends the north west corner of the state—about 170 miles long and 60 miles broad." *Stuart, vol. 2, p. 336.*

* Most of those lands have been sold by the soldiers to other individuals, and are now owned in great quantities by gentlemen in the eastern states. * * * They have been sold by the soldiers for about 50 dollars for a quarter section, containing 160 acres." *Letter from Mr. Duncan, of Vandalia. Stuart, vol. 2, p. 396.*

This is at the rate of 31¼ cents. per acre; while the upset price of land sold by Congress is 125 cents. per acre.

downwright contradiction, to the general way of proceeding.

As soon as the French settlement in Lower Canada, which was established by private adventurers, became of sufficient importance to deserve the attention of the mother-country, the court of Versailles proceeded to grant all the land within reach of emigrants, and much that was beyond their reach, to certain courtiers or creatures of courtiers. Each of these grantees obtained an immense tract, on two conditions; first, that neither he nor his descendants should ever part with the property; secondly, that he should grant leases, on condition of receiving services like those required from the holders of land under the worst feudal system of Europe. In this case, court favour, than which nothing is much more irregular, was the means of obtaining property in land; or, if we are to consider the second condition attached to these *seigneuries* as leaving them open to use by settlers, then the means of obtaining land were as irregular and whimsical as the feudal services required from tenants. Upon the whole, however, it will seem that the establishment of these absurd lordships in the wilderness, was, after the Dutch plan in South Africa, the best way to ruin the colony, by means of the restrictions thereby imposed on the useful appropriation of waste land. In the French colony of Louisiana, on the contrary, "lands,"

says the Abbè Raynal, "were granted indiscriminately to every person who applied for them, and in the manner in which he desired them." Here, then, instead of a system, land was disposed of according to the irregular fancies of individuals. This might be called a rule for the disposal of waste land, if it were not clear that every gratification of an individual fancy, as to the extent and situation of grants, was calculated to prevent the gratification of other individual fancies. The historian of French Louisiana, one of the many colonies that has perished, goes on to say—"Had it not been for this original error, Louisiana would not have languished for so long a time; immense deserts would not have separated the colonists from each other. Being brought near to a common centre they would have assisted each other, and would have enjoyed all the advantages of a well regulated society. Instead of a few hordes of savages, we should have seen a rising colony, which might in time have become a powerful nation, and procured infinite advantages to France."

In Upper Canada land has been granted, *at the same time*, to favourites of the colonial court for nothing; to others, for bribes paid to colonial officers;* to some, on condition of paying a quit

* "Will you inform the Committee of the sums that have been paid by the Canada Company, and their appropriation?

rent to the government, which quit rent was exacted in some cases and not in others; to some, for nothing, because they were American royalists; to others, for so much money per acre, paid openly to the government, and disposed of in various jobs of which the note below gives an example; to the political clergy for nothing, as we have seen before; and even to the grantor, to the crown itself, in the preposterous shape of crown reserves. In this colony, too, while all these ways of granting land were pursued at once, during the very period of this irregularity in

* * * * Thirdly, 2,566*l.*, as *an annual compensation*, for the period of seven years, to those officers of the land-granting department in Upper Canada, who, by the adoption of the new regulations for granting lands, are *deprived of their emoluments.*" See evidence of the Right Honorable R. Wilmot Horton, M. P. and Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, delivered before a Select Committee of the House of Commons, on the Civil Government of Canada, 1828. The Report of this Committee, which fills a thick folio volume, is crowded with examples of jobbing in the disposal of waste land.

"The surveyors receive their compensation in land, and generally *secure the most valuable portions.* When I was in Canada, they would sell their best lots for one dollar per acre; while 13*l.* 10*s.*, the fee on one hundred acres, amount to more than half a dollar per acre. I never met with any one person, amongst all those with whom I conversed on the subject, who did not agree, that, if a settler had but a very little money, it would be much more to his advantage to buy land than to receive it from the government." *Letters from North America, by Adam Hodgson. Vol. 2, p. 47.*

granting land, grants were refused with equal irregularity: because the applicant had offended the governor; because he asked for land in a favourable situation reserved by the governor, in his excellency's mind, I mean, for some relative or dependent; because he wanted land, in a situation which his excellency, in his wisdom, thought not fit for settlement, and, in his power, resolved should continue desert; because this spot was intended for the site of a town, and that for some military purpose; because this district had not been surveyed, or this was, in the governor's opinion, too thickly peopled; or that required more people, and was, on that day, the only spot in which a grant would be made. Such are not all, but only a few, of the very different and often contradictory grounds on which, at one and the same time, waste land was granted and withheld in this colony down to last year.

In New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, colonies not fifty years old, land has been granted and refused on all sorts of different and contradictory grounds; granted by favour, for money, for public services, real or pretended, to English lords and members of parliament, because they were lords and members of parliament, to the political clergy, to schools and other institutions; granted unconditionally and with conditions; conditions fulfilled in some cases but much oftener neglected; granted on account of the applicant's

wealth, that is, because he was able to invest capital on the land, and on account of his poverty, that is, on the score of charity: refused according to every whim of every successive governor, always a sailor or a soldier, as fit to manage a great work of public economy as Adam Smith was fit to navigate a ship or command a regiment. To save the reader's time, in order that he may be able to imagine the excessive irregularity with which land has been granted, *and* withheld in these colonies, I shall state two facts, out of hundreds, which tend to establish that here, as to the disposal of new land, the government has been regular in nothing but irregularity.

1. About four years ago, General Darling being governor of New South Wales, the colonial office in London, used to distribute a "regulation," by which it was declared that any person in England wishing to settle in New South Wales, would obtain, on reaching the colony, a grant of land extensive in proportion to the capital that he was prepared to invest on it. On the faith of this regulation, people used to emigrate with their capital. One of them, with the regulation in his hand, waits upon the governor, and begs for a grant of land still at the disposal of government, in the county of Cumberland; as near, that is, to the town of Sydney as the previous disposal of waste land would allow. Has he brought a

letter of recommendation to the governor, or the treasurer, or the secretary, or some member of council? If yes, if the letter come from a powerful man or woman in England, the grant is made out. If no, then says the governor or his deputy—we wish to promote settlements in Wellington Valley, two hundred miles from Sydney, on the western side of the Blue Mountains. Take a grant there, or do without a grant: in other words, go back to England or bury yourself and utterly waste your capital in a distant wilderness. What, it may be asked, could be the governor's motive for this cruel injustice? a desire to spread his dominion, to make the colony appear wide upon the map, to be able to boast of new settlements far apart, (this is the merit), far apart from each other! Some of the evils of this ignorant desire are well described in the following extract from a letter addressed, in 1832, by General Clausel to Marshal Soult. "Tout devenait facile, si on eût suivi le système de colonization que j'avais établi. N'ayant plus à m'occuper de Constantine et d'Oran, j'aurais porté tous mes soins, toute mon attention, sur la ville d'Alger et les environs. Notre établissement sur ce point, aisément surveillé, eût pris, peu à peu, et sans exiger presque aucun frais, une extension suffisante. A mesure que des colons Européens seraient arrivés, on aurait gagné du terrain; et lorsque les besoins de la colonie l'eussent exigé, on aurait pris une partie suffisante du territoire d'Oran et de Constantine. Vouloir *colonizer en même temps la régence toute entière*, vouloir mettre des garnisons sur tous les points, avoir la prétention de tout retenir dès aujourd'hui sous notre domination immediate, tout cela me parait être un projet chimerique: en faire même l'essai serait de compromettre le succès de notre établissement en Afrique, et entrainer l'état, en pure perte, dans des dépenses ruineuses."

2. During the rule of this same governor of New South Wales, it was proposed to make a road between Sydney and Hunter's River, a spot where some settlements had been formed, but between which and Sydney, there was no communication except by the sea and Hunter's River. This road was to pass through a district, the whole of which, though of course nearer to Sydney than the settlements on Hunter's River, remained in the hands of government. Now, before the government began to make the road, two or three applications were made for grants of land in this district; small grants of less than a hundred acres each; modest applications, considering that the applicants were persons of high official rank in the colony, and near connections of the governor to boot. The applications were successful, of course. Some how or other, the new road took the direction of these grants; over or by the side of which, therefore, all travellers by land between Sydney and Hunter's River

necessarily passed. On each of these grants a house was built; a house, which, being licensed (for they have a licensing system in New South Wales) became an inn. These inns, then, were the only places on the line of road at which travellers could stop for rest and refreshment. Of course such a monopoly caused the prices of rest and refreshment to be very high; gave very high profits to the inn-keepers. Other persons, desirous to share in these high profits, now applied for grants of land on the line of road. No, said the governor, or one of these inn-keepers, you may have land on Hunter's River or in Wellington Valley; but along this line of road no more land will be granted at present. Thus the power of the governor to grant or withhold waste land was used in this case, with the effect, and one can hardly doubt for the purpose, of turning two or three of his Excellency's favourites into highwaymen; of enabling them to rob all travellers between Sydney and Hunter's River; to rob them of somewhat less than the difference between the the cost of going round by sea and the cost of travelling on a straight road open to the competition of inn-keepers. It would not be easy to find, even in Ireland, a match for this job; but many to match it have taken place in New South Wales. My authority for this statement is Mr. Potter Macqueen, late member of parliament for Bedfordshire; himself the proprietor of a large tract of land in New South Wales, and, as such,

an instance of the shameful irregularity with which new land has been disposed of in that colony.

For granting land at the Swan River Settlement, regulations, made by Sir George Murray and Mr. Horace Twiss, the chief and under secretaries of state for the colonies, were published in England; but not till after Sir George Murray had granted 500,000 acres to the cousin of his colleague Sir Robert Peel. This grant to Mr. Peel was obtained by means of a letter, which has been published, from Sir Robert to Sir George. Some member of the house of commons having said that this transaction was a job, Sir Robert Peel defended it; and Mr. now Lord Brougham, the author of a book on colonial policy, rising after the right honourable baronet, declared, that for the first time the right honourable baronet had made an "unnecessary speech;" so complete, or rather so unnecessary, was the vindication of his conduct. The grant, however, to Sir Robert's cousin, of more land than had been granted in New South Wales during thirty-four years, and the outcry that was raised against it, compelled the government to give land to other people in the same way; that is, with the most reckless profusion. Thus the only advantage obtained by Mr. Peel over other settlers was his being allowed to mark out his grant upon the map in England, and to chuse what he considered the very best situation. But this, though it has proved of no

advantage to Mr. Peel, was very injurious to all the other settlers; because as he had selected his grant round about the port or landing place, so great an extent of land in the very best situation became private property, as to render all the other situations very bad in comparison. If Mr. Peel had been compelled to make roads through his grant, or had obtained only such an extent of land as might easily have had roads made through it by the government, the case would have been different. As it was, his property became as a desert between the port or landing place, and the land beyond that property. Beyond that desert, however, it was declared, that all the world should be entitled to unlimited grants, on either one of two conditions, as the grantee should prefer; either an outlay of 1*s.* 6*d.* per acre in conveying labourers to the settlement, or the investment of capital on the land at the rate of 1*s.* 6*d.* per acre. The second of these conditions was flatly at variance with the first. The object of the first condition was to promote the emigration of labourers in proportion to the land granted; but as those who had obtained land on the second condition wanted labourers, and, not having spent capital on the immigration of labourers, were able to offer higher wages than those who had, the labourers brought out by one set of capitalists were taken from them by another set; and thus it came to happen that no one had a motive for

obtaining land on the first condition. One of the conditions made the other a nullity: just as elsewhere, the profusion of one governor and the caution of his successor, or the profusion of one and the caution of his predecessor, or the profusion and caution of the same governor either at different times, or with respect to different parts of the same colony at the same time, have had opposite tendencies; have tended to increase, and, as the people were increasing, to decrease, the proportion between the inhabitants of a colony and the land open to cultivation.

All these cases pretty well establish, that in no modern colony has the best way, or indeed any one way, of treating waste land been pursued systematically: to these cases it would be easy to add *several hundreds* of different and often contradictory modes, in which the governments of modern Europe have disposed of the chief element of colonization.

What is the best mode in which to dispose of waste land with a view to colonization? In order to ascertain this, we must first determine what is, or ought to be, the immediate object of a colonizing government in exerting its power over waste land. The accomplishment of that immediate object would be a way to ultimate ends.

Why should any government exert power over waste land either by giving or withholding? Why not let individuals judge for themselves as to the

situation and extent of new land that each individual should like to call his own? This course has been recommended by some English economists;* on the ground that individuals are the best judges of what is for their own interest, and that all unnecessary interference of government with the affairs of individuals, is sure to do more harm than good. But in this case, the government must necessarily interfere to some extent: that is, it must establish or confirm a title to the land of which individuals had taken possession. Or, perhaps, those English economists, who deprecate the interference of government in the disposal of waste land, would have each settler on new land to be a "squatter;" a settler without any title, liable to be ousted by any other man who was stronger, and who, being the best judge of his own interest, should think it worth while to oust the first occupier. Passing by so absurd a conclusion from the principle of non-interference, let us now suppose the case, in which a colonizing government should confine its interference to securing a property in that land of which individuals had taken possession. In this case, all the land, to which it was possible that government should afterwards give a title, would immediately be taken possession of

* Especially by Mr. Mill; in a Letter to Mr. Wilmot Horton, not printed but industriously circulated, by the latter.

by a few individuals; good judges of their own interest, consulting their own advantage. But what, in this case, would become of all the other individuals, who in pursuit of their own advantage, might be desirous to obtain some waste land? This question settles the point. For the good of all, the interference of government is not less necessary to prevent a few individuals from seizing all the waste land of a colony, than it is necessary to prevent robberies. As it is for the good of all that no one should be allowed to take any other one's property, so it is for the good of all that no individual should be allowed to injure other individuals by taking more than the right quantity of waste land. In the former case, government enforces a compact amongst all the members of a society; an agreement that any one who takes the property of another shall be punished: so, in the latter case, the interference of government with respect to waste land is nothing but the enforcement of a compact amongst all who are interested in the disposal of waste land; an agreement that none shall be allowed to injure the others, that the greatest good of all shall be consulted. This point settled, what, for the greatest good of all, is the immediate object of a colonizing government in exerting its power over waste land? Its ultimate object being the greatest progress of colonization, its immediate object is, that there should exist in the colony

those circumstances which are best calculated to attract capital and labour, but especially labour, from an old country. The advantage of the immigrants, though one of the ends, is also an essential means, of colonization. For the greatest advantage of immigrants to a colony, it is necessary that the colonial profits of capital, and wages of labour, should be as high as possible. High profits, then, and especially high wages, are the immediate object of a colonizing government in exerting its power over waste land.

In order to create and maintain a very high rate of wages in the colony, it is necessary, first, that the colonists should have an ample field of production; ample, that is, in proportion to capital and labour; such an extent of land as to render unnecessary the cultivation of inferior soils, and as to permit a large proportion of the people to be engaged in agriculture; a field, large from the beginning, and continually enlarged with the increase of capital and people. But, in the second place, it is quite as necessary that the field of production should never be too large; should never be so large as to encourage hurtful dispersion; as to promote that cutting up of capital and labour into small fractions, which, in the greater number of modern colonies, has led to poverty and barbarism, or speedy ruin. For securing the first condition of high profits and wages, the power of the government over

waste land must be exerted actively, in bestowing upon individuals titles to the possession of land: for the second object, that power must be exerted negatively, in refusing titles to waste land. The action of the two exertions of power together, may be compared to that of an elastic belt, which, though always tight, will always yield to pressure from within.

But as a belt which should press more in one place than in another, or should be more tight at one time than at another, would be defective, so would any system for granting and refusing waste land be defective, which should not be both uniform and lasting.

It is easy to grant land, and easy to refuse applications for grants: the difficulty is to draw a line between the active and negative exertions of power, so as to render the proportion which land bears to people, neither too small nor too great for the highest profits and wages.

With a view, not deliberate, certainly, but rather instinctive, to maintaining a due proportion between people and land, three methods of proceeding have been adopted by several colonial governments: first, that of attaching conditions to grants of land; secondly, that of imposing a tax on the land granted, and in case the tax was not paid, seizing and selling the land for arrears of taxes; thirdly, that of requiring payment in

money for waste land before the grant was made out.

In the first mode of proceeding, the grantee obtained his land on such conditions, for example, as that of cultivating it, or that of paying a quit rent; and in either case the grant was liable to be recalled provided the condition was not observed. But grants of land have scarcely ever been recalled because the land had not been cultivated, or the quit rent had not been paid. Why such conditions have nearly always been a dead letter is plain enough: because the term "cultivation" is so general and vague that no tribunal could decide whether or not that condition had been fulfilled; while all the holders of land obtained on that condition, including frequently the members of the only tribunal to which the question could be submitted, have made common cause to prevent the question from being raised:*

* The grants at the Swan River were declared liable to be forfeited unless they should be "*cultivated* to the satisfaction of the governor;" a gentleman deserving, on many accounts, very great respect; but, nevertheless, a naval captain, whose knowledge of "cultivation" must necessarily be small, and who, besides, owns in the colony, a hundred, perhaps a thousand, times as much land as it is possible that he should cultivate. Is it to be expected, that he will declare his own land to be forfeited for want of cultivation?

Mr. Ellice, now war-minister of England, was asked by the Committee of the House of Commons on the Civil Government of Canada, whether escheats of land had taken place under the 6th of George IV, which empowered the government to seize and sell lands, as to which certain conditions had not been performed. He answered, "None, that I am aware of." But then, he had just before informed the committee, that, "grants had been most inconsiderately and wantonly made, in large masses, to people connected with government, to the great detriment of the country and the great nuisance of the inhabitants around;" that land had been so granted "in large masses, since it was the fashion for every *councillor or officer connected with the Government*, to get a grant of from 5,000 to 20,000 acres;" that many of "those grantees were absentees; and some governors of the colony." The evidence of Mr. Ellice before this committee, and especially that part of it which relates to the disposal of waste land, is full of instruction for colonizing governments.

because, as to quit rents, all who obtained land on condition of paying them, including the favorites of governments, and frequently the officers of government themselves, have made common cause to prevent the recal of grants for non-payment of quit rent. Thus, while such conditions were sure to be neglected, the certainty of being able to disregard them led so many people to acquire more property than they could possibly use, that the grantees would not have been able, supposing them willing, to have observed the conditions; would not have been able to cultivate so much more land than there were labourers to employ, or to have paid quit rent for so much land which yielded nothing. Judging

from these cases, and from very many more in which conditions have been attached to grants without an attempt to enforce them, it seems impossible to devise any after condition, in the nature of a promise, which would hinder people from taking more land than they ought to take; which would render the belt always tight, while always sufficiently elastic.

Secondly. Though by imposing a tax on granted land which remains in a desert state, and selling the land for arrears of taxes, some check would be put to the misappropriation of new land, still this plan is open to the same objections as the one just examined: the execution of the plan would be difficult or next to impossible: it is but another mode of attaching to grants the after condition of cultivation. In some of the United States, truly, this plan has been successfully pursued with respect to deserts of private property, which had become private property before the plan of taxing and seizing was adopted. But why was this plan devised? Not to prevent, but to cure, the evils of deserts interposed amongst the settlers. Act upon this plan with respect to all desert land now private property, still what is to be done with the land so seized, or recovered, by the government? Is it to be granted again in such a way as to call for a second seizure and a third grant of the same lots of land? This plan may be good for the cure of an evil, but is, plainly

quite insufficient to prevent the evil. It has been successful, as a cure, in some of the United States, only because, since the evil arose which it was intended to cure, another plan had been adopted to prevent the evil as to all new grants.

But, thirdly, it is obvious that a government may put any degree of restraint on the acquisition of waste land, by means of conditions to be performed before the grant is bestowed; by making the grant itself conditional on some previous act by the grantee. Of this nature was a part of the plan for granting land at the Swan River; that part by which he, who had paid for the conveyance of labourers to the colony, was entitled to waste land in proportion to his outlay. Not less strictly of this nature, though somewhat more obviously, is the plan now pursued by the United States; that of requiring payment in money for new grants. This appears to be the most sure and most simple way to prevent the improper acquisition of waste land. For, though many expedients might be suggested for rendering the grant conditional on the performance of some act by the grantee, such as withholding the title until the land was cultivated, still in all of these ways of proceeding much room would be left for favour, for disputes and evasion, as well as for miscalculation on the part of the grantee; not to mention that, if time were required for the performance of the condition of title, all new land

must pass through a state of uncertainty as to its ownership; being used in some way by individuals with a view to gaining a title, and yet not the property of individuals, but liable to be resumed by the government in case the condition of a title were not thoroughly performed. The great merit of the system pursued by the United States consists in its simplicity, and the certainty of its operation.

Still, the object of the government, or rather of the community, would be missed, if the payment required for waste land were not so high as to deter individuals from taking more land than, for the benefit of the whole society, they ought to take. If the price were so low that great tracts should be attainable by paying a trifle of money, individuals, speculating vaguely on some distant benefit to arise from the increase of population, would acquire great tracts without being willing, or even able, to use them; would interpose great deserts amongst the settlers; would produce an extreme degree of dispersion, reducing the power of capital and labour to the minimum, and rendering out of the case both high profits and high wages. Thus, at the Swan River, though some grantees paid money for their land, when they paid for the passage of emigrant labourers, still as the rate of payment was two hundred acres for each labourer, or 1*s.* 6*d.* per acre, they were not prevented from taking a great

deal more land than they could use. In this case, the object of requiring money for land would not have been attained, even if the system had been uniform; if none had been allowed to acquire land save by paying money for it. So, in the United States, where, for want of combinable free-labour, slavery is, one may say, a necessity; where restrictions on foreign trade and bounties on home manufactures, are, not in opposition to, but in strict agreement with, the first principles of political economy, being, after slavery, the chief means by which the people are kept together, and induced to keep each other; where, notwithstanding these expedients for promoting combination of power, it is a general practice to exhaust the fertility of land, trusting to nature for nearly all, and to skill for hardly anything; where, though not half of the appropriated land be cultivated, the people are moving on, leaving great gaps of desert behind them, in search of more land to be treated in the same way; there, it seems evident, the price put upon waste land is too low for the object in view. And this conclusion is supported by particular facts. In the newest settlements, universally, we find much land, which is become private property without being used in any way; not even cleared of the forest; taken out of the control of the public, and yet of no service to any individual; while all such land interposes so much desert, or

so many deserts, amongst the settlers, increasing the distance by which they are separated, interfering with the construction of roads, and operating as a check to social intercourse, to concert, to exchange, and to the skilful use of capital and labour.

On the other hand, it is equally plain that too high a price might be required for waste land. If it be for the good of all that no waste land should be granted without being used beneficially, it is equally for the good of all that none should be withheld from individuals able and willing to use it in the best way. In order to make the belt elastic as well as tight, in order that the field of production should increase gradually along with the increase of capital and labour, it would be necessary to require for new land a price not more than sufficient to prevent the improper acquisition of land; it would be necessary to make the price so low, that the acquisition and use of new land should be one of the most productive employments of capital. To make the price so high, that the acquisition and use of new land should not be one of the most productive employments of capital, would be equal to a decree that no more land should be used in any way; would encompass the settled parts of the colony, not with an elastic belt, but with "a wall of brass;" would, as soon as capital and labour had reached an excessive proportion

to land, cause low profits and low wages; would prevent the immigration of people; would inevitably defeat the objects of colonization; just as if all the land of a colony were granted suddenly to a few persons neither able nor willing to use it, but willing and able to prevent others from using it. The golden mean, a term often misapplied to some degree between right and very wrong, really signifies the right degree and nothing else: for this case, in which contrary powers are to be exerted, the power of granting and the power of withholding, the golden mean is all in all. Some remarks will be offered presently on the class of facts, which a colonizing people would take as their guide for ascertaining the best price of new land.

Meanwhile, we have to dispose of two questions hardly less important than the question of price.

First, supposing the best price ascertained, the beneficial operation of it might be checked, nay, altogether prevented in two different ways; either by opposing obstacles to the acquisition of land at that price, or by granting land on other terms. Thus, in New South Wales, where the English government has been persuaded to adopt the plan of selling new land instead of giving it away,*

* Ever since May, 1829, the Colonial Department in London has been urged, in various ways, to adopt the American plan of selling waste land, instead of jobbing it according to

the governor's caprice still determines whereabouts land shall be surveyed and granted.

the English plan. For a long while, this suggestion was either fiercely opposed or treated with ridicule, by persons connected with the colonial office, and especially by Mr. Wilmot Horton and Mr. Hay, one of them lately, and the other still, Under Secretary of State for the Colonies. This suggestion, having been pressed upon the government by a society established for the purpose of promoting systematic colonization, Mr. Wilmot Horton, jealous, it would seem, of any interference with a subject, part of which had employed his thoughts for some years, became a member of the society, and then broke it up by getting into the chair at a public meeting, and zealously condemning the objects of those with whom he had professed to unite himself. But, at the same time, he greatly promoted the objects of the society by attacking their views, and thus causing those views to be examined. As an example of the assistance which he thus gave to the dispersed members of the society, I may mention, that he persuaded Colonel Torrens to join him in conducting a written controversy with two of those gentlemen, and that, in the end, Colonel Torrens became one of the warmest advocates of the measure to which he had objected when it was first submitted to him. Not the least impression, however, was made upon the government while the Duke of Wellington's administration lasted. But, soon after the change of ministry which followed the three days of Paris, soon after Lord Howick succeeded Mr. Horace Twiss as Under Secretary for the Colonies, the measure suggested by the *Colonization Society* was, in part, adopted by the government. Defective as is that part of a measure; defective because incomplete; still it cannot fail to be of great service to the colonies. Whatever the people of Canada and of the English settlements in Australia may gain by the check which has thus been put upon official jobbing in the disposal of waste

Though any one may wait upon the governor with the new regulations in his hand, saying,—I want

land, they owe, not very remotely, to the workmen of Paris or M. de Poliguac. For this great improvement they are more immediately obliged to Lord Howick; to the leading members of the *Colonization Society*, Mr. John Sterling, Mr. Hutt now M.P. for Hull, and Mr. Charles Tennant, then M. P. for St. Alban's; and, more especially to Mr. Robert Gouger, the secretary of the society, whose efforts to procure the adoption of its whole plan have been unceasing for several years. The successful issue of Mr. Gouger's long contest with the judgements of ignorance, the insults of pride and the delays of idleness, should be a lesson of encouragement to the advocates of useful projects. Here follows the most correct list that I have been able to obtain of the members of the *Colonization Society*.

Woronzow Greig, Esq.
W. S. O'Brien, Esq. M. P.
R. H. Innes, Esq.
John Hutt, Esq.
I. H. Thomas, Esq.
I. W. Buckle, Esq.
John Sterling, Esq.
Edward King, Esq.
Robert Scott, Esq. (of New South Wales)
Howard Elphinstone, Esq.
Saml. Humphreys, Esq.
Charles Buller, Esq.
C. Holte Bracebridge, Esq.
John Young, Esq.
E. Barnard, Esq.
Sir J. C. Hobhouse, Bart. M. P.
John Gibson, Esq.
Sir Francis Burdett, Bart.
Clayton Brown, Esq.
T. Kavanagh, Esq. M. P.
James Talbot, Esq.
Charles Tennant, Esq.
Lucius O'Brien, Esq. M. P.
John Mill, Esq.
G. S. Tucker, Esq.
Col. Torrens.
J. E. Bicheno, Esq.
R. Trench, Esq.
William Hutt, Esq.
Rev. G. V. Sampson.
Lawrence Marshall, Esq.
Right Hon. R. W. Horton.
John Gore, Esq.
Arthur Gregory, Esq.
Richard Heathfield, Esq.

so many acres in such a spot: take my money,—the governor may reply, No; that spot is reserved:

Sir Philip Sidney.	Erskine Humphreys, Esq.
Hyde Villiers, Esq.	T. Potter Macqueen, Esq. M.P.
John Buckle, Esq.	Colonel Talbot, M. P.

Hon. Secretary, Robert Gouger, Esq.

The views of the Society were first published in a supplement to the *Spectator* newspaper, and afterwards reprinted in a pamphlet, entitled *A Statement of the Principles and Objects of a proposed National Society for the cure and prevention of pauperism by means of Systematic Colonization.* Ridgway, 1830. Those views have been further explained in the following publications.

Sketch of a proposal for colonizing Australasia; printed and circulated, but not sold, in 1829.

A Letter to the Right Honourable Sir George Murray on Systematic Colonization, by Charles Tennant, Esq. M. P.—Ridgway, 1830. This pamphlet contains a Report of the Society, and a *Controversy* between Mr. Hutt and Mr. Sterling, on one side, and Mr. Wilmot Horton and Col. Torrens, on the other.

Letters forming part of a Correspondence with Nassau William Senior, Esq., concerning Systematic Colonization, &c. by Charles Tennant, Esq. M. P. Ridgway, 1831.

A Letter from Sydney, the principal town of Australasia, edited by Robert Gouger. Joseph Cross, Holborn, 1829. Reprinted from the *Morning Chronicle* newspaper.

Eleven Letters in the Spectator newspaper, signed P. 1830 *and* 1831.

A Lecture on Colonization delivered before the Literary Association, at the London Tavern, on December 5, 1831 : *by R. Davies Hanson, Esq.* Ridgway and Sons. 1832.

Proposal to His Majesty's Government for founding a colony on the South Coast of Australia. Printed and circulated, but not sold, in 1831.

you must chuse elsewhere. Nay, until the governor have declared a spot open for settlement, until it please him to *offer* land for sale, no one can now obtain new land any where on any terms. Here, then, is the restriction of price, without liberty subject to that restriction. If the price fixed on land had been the right one, sufficient, that is, for the purpose of restraint, all further restraint could not but have been hurtful; could not but have interfered with the due operation of the proper price. From this example we may gather, what indeed no fact was required to establish, so obvious is the conclusion; that, along with the best price for waste land, there ought to be the most perfect liberty of appropriation at that price. This is secured in the United States by very simple regulations.

But this secured, what if there should be exceptions to the system? what if some portions of new land should be granted on some other condition than purchase, or for less money than the general price, or for nothing? The result is plain:

Plan of a Company to be established for founding a colony in Southern Australia. Ridgway and Sons. 1831.

Article in the *Literary Gazette.* 1831.

Emigration and Colonization. A speech delivered at a general meeting of the National Colonization Society in June, 1830, *by William Hutt, Esq. M. P.* Wilson, Royal Exchange, 1832.

Emigration for the Relief of Parishes, practically considered, by Robert Gouger. Ridgway and Sons, Piccadilly; and Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange. 1833.

the object sought by the best price would be defeated in proportion to the extent of exceptional grants. If land were given, as in the United States, to schools and colleges, deserts would still be interposed amongst the settlers; and either this would happen, or waste land would be sold for less than the price generally required by government, if new land were given for nothing by way of reward for public services. Every special grant, besides, made for nothing or for less than the general price, would be an act of great injustice towards those who had paid the general price: unless, indeed, the government should proclaim, before taking money from any one, that it intended to grant land for nothing in special cases. Such a declaration, however, by the government, though it would be a fair warning to individuals, and would thus prevent any injustice, could not but greatly interfere with the sale of land at the best price; for it would amount to saying, Beware, land buyers, of paying to us, the government, more than will suffice to buy land from individuals on whom we mean to bestow grants for nothing. Whereas, if the plan of selling at a fixed price were the only one, if the system were uniform, the due operation of the best price would be perfectly secured; no deserts would be interposed amongst the settlers; no one would sell land for less than the government price; every buyer would make his calculations accordingly; and no one would suffer the least injustice.

Still, notwithstanding the force of all these reasons in favour of an uniform system, a colonial government would always be strongly tempted to make exceptional grants; a bad colonial government, by the wish to favour individuals, by all the motives which any where lead to government jobs; a good colonial government, by finding this the easiest way to reward public services and to provide for public education. In both cases, the temptation to go wrong would become very powerful indeed after the plan of selling had been acted on for some time; after it had given to waste land outside of the settled districts, or still within them, a greater value than waste land ever possessed before. Suppose the people so far kept together, so far in a condition to help each other, that their industry was more productive than colonial industry has ever been; in that case, all their land would be subject to some of those advantages, over and above superior natural fertility, for which rent is paid; and all the land adjoining the settled districts would be in a state to become very soon, with the increase of wealth and people, subject to the higher degrees of competition. Presents, therefore, of new land would now be worth more than such presents have ever been worth: the temptation to make such presents would be greater in proportion to their greater value; while that greater value of the thing desired would whet the ingenuity of pari-

sites and jobbers, in devising new pretexts for an improper use of the power of government. In the case of a good colonial government, even in the case of a government strictly representing all the colonists, the temptation to go wrong would become stronger with an increase in the value of new land: it would be more easy than it ever has been to reward public services aad provide for public education by means of gifts of new land. And why not, some would ask, do in the easiest way that which ought to be done? The question may be answered by another. Since the easiest way to prevent a criminal from committing more crimes is to hang him, why not hang all criminals? why not do in the easiest way that which ought to be done? Because more harm would come to society by making the law hateful, than would be prevented by preventing criminals from committing more crimes; because that very easy mode of hindering some from committing crimes would encourage others to commit crimes, by rendering conviction or even detection impossible in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. Just so, in colonization, by providing for so great a good as public education in the easiest way, that is, by exceptional grants of land, more harm than good would be done to society. But if, as may easily happen, this should be denied by those, who are not familiar with the evils resulting to colonies from a profuse exercise by the government of its power over waste land, I would remind these, that the choice does not lie between knowledge and ignorance, but between two modes of securing education: just as, in jurisprudence, the choice is, not between the prevention and non-prevention of crimes by persons already criminal, but between two modes of prevention, the easiest mode, hanging, and a troublesome mode, the reformation or confinement of the criminals. If all the waste land, without exception, were sold at the right price, then might public education be provided for out of the money paid for land; or, the people being richer, because kept more together, by means of contributions from the public in the shape of taxes. A moderate land tax, for example, would take from each proprietor of land less than would be bestowed upon him by an uniform system of selling new land at the best price. If, on the contrary, the great good of public education were sought by means of exceptional grants, a door would be left open for other exceptions. Those, for example, who think a political church very good, would demand exceptional grants for that purpose; if real public services were rewarded by exceptional grants, such grants might be made for pretended public services. Once allow, by admitting a single exception, that the facility of doing good in this way is a sufficient reason for taking this way to do good, and pretexts would

never be wanting for doing harm in so easy a way; harm of two sorts, that which *might* arise from giving land for improper purposes, and that which *must* arise from counteracting the desired effect of requiring the proper price for every addition of territory.

The importance of complete uniformity in any system for treating the chief element of colonization is so great, that I am tempted, at the risk of tiring the reader, to illustrate my view of the subject by a supposed case, which will be readily understood, even by those who have never witnessed the mischievous effects on a colony of irregularity in granting and withholding new land.

Suppose that the English government had found a mass of pure gold in Middlesex, close to the surface of the ground, and weighing some thousands of millions of pounds; and further, that it was an object of great moment to the people of England to keep up the present value of gold, neither more nor less. In that case, how would the government, supposing it bent on the advantage of the people, use its power over this rich mine? Here would be a very easy way of paying off the national debt; but if this were done in this way, more evil would come to the people than if their debt had been doubled. Supposing, as we do, that the object was to preserve the actual value of gold, then would the govern-

ment supply the people with enough gold to make up for the wear and tear of the currency, and to maintain, if the people and their money transactions were increasing, the actual proportion between the demand and supply of gold. But in order to issue gold enough, without issuing too much, some rule must be adopted. Supposing a good rule adopted, would it ever, in any case be departed from? Clearly not; because a general plan with exceptions would be, not a rule, but several plans working at the same time, and perhaps in opposite directions. The rule, to be worth any thing for its object, must be complete: that is, whatever the mode of issuing gold adopted by way of rule, it must be strictly observed, or it would be no rule at all. In such a a case, there would not be wanting people to ask for gold, as a reward for public services, real or pretended, as a support for religion, as a fund for charity or for public education. Our object, each set of applicants would say, is so very, very important, and the facility of accomplishing it in this way is so very, very great, that we are entitled to an exception from the general rule. But to all of these applicants a good government would answer: obtain gold according to the rule; in no other way will we issue a single ounce, seeing that our first duty in this matter is to maintain the value of money by strictly observing the rule. But now suppose this case

with a careless or corrupt government. Here, if any rule were adopted in appearance, the exceptions would be so many as to make the rule a nullity. If the members of this careless or corrupt government had sense enough to perceive, that extreme profusion in the issue of gold must soon render the mine worthless, they would, for their own sake, issue gold with some caution, but still with shameful injustice, favouring some at the expense of others, granting at one time and refusing at another, causing violent fluctuations in the value of money, and in time ruining every one of their richer subjects, one after the other. If the government were very ignorant as well as careless and corrupt, it would be tempted, by the facility of doing favours and complying with urgent requests, to issue so much gold, that the mine would soon be worth nothing, and there would be an end of the mischief. Colonizing governments, being, nearly all of them, careless and corrupt, have, most of them, had sense enough to perceive, that there was a degree of profusion in granting waste land which would render worthless their power over this element of wealth. Not so the government which founded the Swan River colony. There the profusion has been so great that waste land is not worth the trouble of accepting it :* the rich mine of gold is worth

* Last year, a hundred thousand acres of picked land near

nothing. But, allowing for some caution in colonial governments, the evils which it is in their power to inflict on their subjects, by the capricious exercise of their power over waste land, are greater than those which would be inflicted on the English by a very ignorant government, having power over an immense quantity of gold. It is the very caution of those colonizing governments, for their own ends, which preserves their power to do mischief. How much mischief they have done, and may yet do, by retaining power over waste land, and exerting that power capriciously, may be conceived, even by the inhabitant of an old country, who will reflect on this supposed case of a very rich gold mine at the disposal of a careless and corrupt government, and who will further bear in mind how much the value of land, of capital, and of labour, depends upon the proportion between land and people.

The last condition of a good rule for the disposal of waste land is permanency. One rule at one time, and another rule at another time, would be nearly as bad as no rule at all. The Swan River settlement has not existed five years; but already three quite different plans have been

the Swan River was offered for sale at the rate of less than a farthing per acre; but no buyer could be found. At the same time, waste land was sold by the government in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land at prices varying from five to twenty shillings per acre.

adopted in that colony for the disposal of new land. In the description of the first plan issued by the English government, it was stated, in so many words, that another plan, which was not described, would be adopted in a year or two: another plan was adopted within less than two years after the first expedition sailed; and then, with the change of ministry in England, came a third plan; all within three years. The first and the last plan were as different as possible. According to the first plan, any one might obtain an unlimited quantity of land for nothing; according to the last, no one could obtain new land except by paying five shillings, at least, per acre. Until 1831, grants were obtainable for nothing in Van Diemen's Land, New South Wales and Canada: this year, no land will be granted except to purchasers: next year, the plan of gratuitous grants may be revived. The last change of system in the English colonies, was brought about, not by an act of the legislature, but simply by means of letters from the English colonial minister to the colonial governors, saying in effect: This is the way in which you will dispose of waste land, until I change my mind, or you hear from my successor. Here, says an anonymous paper issued from Downing-street on the 1st of March 1831; here is "a summary of the rules which it has been *thought fit to substitute* for those dated the 20th of July 1830." Here,

says another anonymous publication from Downing-street, dated January 20, 1831, is "a summary of the rules which it has been *thought fit* to lay down for regulating the sales of land in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land." Who thought fit? thought fit to make such very important changes in the political economy of these colonies? The English colonial minister: but his successor may *think fit* to change back again to the old plan, or to adopt some entirely new plan; and whatever an ignorant, lazy, English lord shall please to call "a summary of rules," to that must the colonists submit without appeal. Allow that the last change is good for the colonists; that the plan now followed is far better than the irregular and corrupt practices for which it has been substituted; still, what security have the buyers of land, according to the new plan, against being cheated of their purchase money by the revival of old practices? The new plan is hateful to the colonial governments, from whom it takes their most valuable privilege; the privilege of jobbing in the disposal of waste land. It is hateful likewise, to those in England, who belong to what has been called "the red tape school of politics," or "the Peel and Dawson crew."* At present, the home minister might give his cousin

* See that clever organ of the political church and of the tory party in England, the *Standard* newspaper.

a letter of introduction to the colonial minister, without getting for that cousin 500,000 acres of waste land. The new plan, which was suggested to the government by a society in London, came upon the colonial governments by surprise. Had they been consulted about it, they would probably, assisted by a strong party in the colonial office at home, have induced lord Goderich to abstain from writing those letters by which the new plan has been set on foot. As it is, human nature will be at fault, if they do not exert themselves to get the old practices revived; and they will be zealously backed by cunning allies in Downing-street. The successor of lord Goderich, a traveller in America, is not likely to revive the old English jobbing plan or practices; but he may, if it please him, by a stroke of his pen; as may his successor. Whatever dependence, then, the colonists may place on the American knowledge, the industry, and, may be, the pride of Mr. Stanley, they have no security, worth the name, for the continuance of the present system. That the new plan, that any plan, should work well, while so liable to be changed or overturned, is quite impossible. They manage these things better in America. There, the disposal of waste land is a separate department of government. The general plan of selling has been established by congress: when the price has been altered, it was congress that decided on the change: congress

alone can make exceptional grants. The system is upheld by the united legislature of all the states, and is administered by persons chosen for their fitness, responsible to the people, and compelled, not only to publish an account of all their proceedings, but to proceed, step by step, in the face of the public. Here, then, are the best securities against change; an act of the legislature with constant publicity. The result is, that, in America, every buyer of waste land knows what he is about, makes his calculations on sure grounds: and that the government obtains by the sale of waste land 3,000,000 dollars a year. If the congress of America were to raise the price of waste land up to that point, which would prevent any hurtful dispersion of the people, without causing any hurtful density of population, and should also cease to make exceptional grants, then would their rule for the disposal of waste land be quite perfect; of the right measure, uniform and lasting; operating like a belt, tight but elastic, all round and at all times. This is the mode of proceeding suggested by the English *Colonization Society*.

In any colony where this perfect rule for treating the chief element of colonization should be adopted, colonization would proceed, not as every where hitherto, more or less, by the scattering of people over a wilderness and placing them for ages in a state between civilization and barbarism, but by the extension to new places of all that

is good in an old society; by the removal to new places of people, civilized, and experienced in all the arts of production; willing and able to assist each other; excited to the most skilful application of capital and labour by ready markets for disposing of surplus produce; producing, by means of the most skilful industry in the richest field, more than colonial industry has ever produced; obtaining the highest profits of capital and the highest wages of labour; offering the strongest attraction for the immigration of capital and people; increasing rapidly; enjoying the advantages of an old society without its evils; without any call for slavery or restrictions on foreign trade; an old society in every thing save the uneasiness of capitalists and the misery of the bulk of the people. Colonization, as hitherto conducted, may be likened to the building of a bridge; a work, no part of which is complete until the whole be completed: according to the method here proposed, colonization would be like the making of a tunnel; a work, in the progress of which each step must be complete before another step can be taken.

Two objections to this system remain to be noticed.

1. It has been said: If the price of new land were high enough to prevent any one from legally acquiring more land than, for the good of the whole society, he ought to acquire, people would

use land without a title; the beneficial compact amongst the colonists, implied by an uniform and fixed rule for the disposal of new land, would not be observed by all the people; some would become *squatters*, that is, settlers on new land without a title. The answer to this objection places the merits of the system in a strong point of view.

It is a remarkable fact, that in the history of American colonization, there is but one instance of a person having settled *totally* out of the reach of markets; the case of the celebrated Daniel Boon, who is known, for what? for his eccentricity. Invariably, then, it may be said, when people use land without a title, they keep within reach of some market in which to obtain, by the sale of what their own labour produces, some thing which their own labour will not produce. They do not intend to cut themselves off from all social intercourse; they use land so near to the settled districts, that it is liable to be taken from them as colonization advances. In many cases, *squatting* has been encouraged by a regulation, which awarded to the holder of land without a title, when the land should be taken from him, compensation for the improvements which he had made upon the land. But, in every case, the *squatter* expects that his land will be taken from him: nay, in most cases, he intends to abandon it as soon as he has exhausted its natural fertility.

The object of the *squatter*, then, is merely to get a few crops from a virgin soil, and then to remove for the purpose of exhausting another spot of virgin soil. But this, Americans know, and Mr. Stuart informs the English, is a general practice in America; not only with squatters, but with those who have paid for land. Why this practice? Because, as I have explained before,* of the minute division of labour in America; because labour, so minutely divided, would not, perhaps, even support the isolated labourer, unless the unproductiveness of his labour were counteracted by the great productiveness of a virgin soil. It is the extreme cheapness of new land which causes this minute division of labour. At all events, calculates the *squatter*, I must work by myself: if I must work by myself, I must, in order to live, use and exhaust a virgin soil: where's the use of paying for land when one's only object is to destroy its fertility? Here is the *squatter's* motive for using land without a title. If the price of new land were such as to keep the people together, so that they might combine their labour, it would be for the interest of every one to remain where he could be assisted and give assistance: the motive of the *squatter* would entirely cease. As it is, no one goes beyond the reach of markets: in that case, we have a right to presume,

* See Note X.

no one would go out of the way of all the great advantages which belong to combination of labour. It appears, therefore, that, by putting a sufficient price upon new land, *squatting*, instead of being encouraged, would be prevented. This will be still more clear, when we shall see with what great rapidity colonization would advance; how very soon a *squatter*, if there were one, not going out of the reach of markets, would be overtaken by society, provided the purchase money of all new land were employed in accelerating the progress of colonization.

2. The second objection is, that into a colony, where new land was not obtainable except by purchase, neither capitalists nor labourers would be disposed to immigrate; but that, on the contrary, from such a colony both classes would be disposed to emigrate to other colonies not far off, where new land was obtainable for nothing.

We cannot decide this point by reference to facts; because in no colony has that price ever been required for new land, which, together with perfect liberty of appropriation, would insure the greatest productiveness of industry, or, in other words, the highest profits and wages. But there are some facts which tend to show, that the attractive power of a colony would be increased by putting a sufficient price upon all new land. Why have so many English and Irish labourers, who had emigrated to Canada, removed from

Canada to the United States? from a colony where land was cheaper to one where it was dearer. The only rational answer is, because employment was more regular, with higher wages, where the people were in some degree kept together than where they were carefully dispersed. Why is not the Swan River colony, where, under a fine climate, land is so very cheap; why is not this a favourite colony with English emigrants, both capitalists and labourers? Why have so many people, both labourers and capitalists, emigrated from the Swan River to colonies where land was dearer? Why does it happen, when a large tract of new land is bought by an American company, and resold by them in lots with great profit, that to this spot people flock, both capitalists and labourers, and here congregate for the advantages which come from mutual assistance. In this last case, as to a great tract of country, the company take the place of government, and will not part with any land except at a higher price than that which they have paid to the government. In all these cases, people are attracted from a worse to a better proportion between land and people; from lower to higher profits and wages. That it should be so, is consistent with the principles of human nature and political economy. True it is, that people now and then go from a better to a worse proportion between land and people; as when citizens of the United States emigrate to Canada:

but these are exceptions to the general rule; just as those who ruin their fortunes and destroy their health by excessive debauchery, do that which is contrary to their own interest, and therefore contrary to a law of political economy and human nature. The case of those capitalists, who emigrate from an old country, led on by the hope of acquiring wealth by obtaining for little or nothing immense tracts of wilderness, arises from profound ignorance. If this case support the objection under review, then, when a child is poisoned by mistaking night-shade berries for red currants, it goes to prove that children have no sentiment of self-preservation. These men act like the colonial minister of England, who sent butts for holding fresh water, to ships that were floating on a fresh water sea. Judging of a desert country by what they see in one thickly peopled, they dream of domains and millions till they awake, having lost their all. But the people of a colony, in which there existed the advantages of a proper degree of concentration, could not be ignorant of those advantages: and the existence, for the first time, of those great advantages would surely become known both in other colonies and in the mother-country. Such a colony, then, would be highly attractive. How much more attractive, both to capitalists and labourers, than colonies have ever been, will be seen in the following section of this treatise; where it is ex-

plained, that if all the purchase-money of waste land were properly disposed of, capitalists in the colony would always be supplied with labour, and every labourer reaching the colony might surely become not only a landowner, but, some thing more grateful to one of his class, a master of other labourers. The first colony in which labour was plentiful, though dear, and in which labourers might be sure to become masters as well as landowners; the first colony in which there was the good without the evil of an old society, would probably attract people, both capitalists and labourers, from colonies in which, along with the good, there was all the evil, of a new society.

II. *The removal of people.*

In a colony where new land was supplied in proportion to the wants of a people increasing rapidly in wealth and numbers; where the produce of industry was so great as to give high profits and high wages, where, consequently, all should possess the means of removal, and where, moreover, the land newly become the property of individuals should increase very rapidly in value, by very soon becoming subject to the higher kinds of competition which produce rent; in such a colony, there would be motives in plenty for the removal of people from the settled to the waste parts of the colony. Colonization would

go on of itself, through the increase of people by births in the colony. But more quickly than in proportion to such increase, colonization could not go on, unless means were found to remove people from some old country. For the immigration of people from an old country, the inducement, we have seen already, would be high profits, and especially high wages. Those who would come in search of high profits may be supposed to possess the means of coming. But those who would most desire to come in search of high wages, are the poorest of the poor in old countries; so poor as to be unable to move from one part to another part of their own country; people who live from hand to mouth, never having any property save their own thews and sinews. This, however, is the class of people whose immigration into a colony it would be most useful to promote; a class who, as labourers should become capitalists and landowners, would fill their place in the market of labour; becoming themselves, in time, capitalists and landowners, and having their place filled, in turn, by immigrants of the same class. These, however strong their inducement to emigration, cannot move without assistance. If they are to move at all, the cost of their passage must be defrayed, or at least advanced, by some body. It might be greatly for the advantage of the old country to defray the cost of their passage; but here we are considering only the means which a

colony possesses of promoting immigration without the aid of an old country. The question then is,—How may a colony advantageously pay for the immigration of labour? that is, build a bridge, as it were, toll-free, for the passage of poor labourers from an old country to the colony?

Reflecting on the urgent want of labour that occurs in all colonies which prosper, we may be sure, that great pains have been taken by people in colonies to devise some means of obtaining a regular supply of labour from old countries. The supplies of labour obtained by kidnapping in the old English colonies of America, by the late immigration of poor Germans into the United States; poor Germans, who, ignorant of the laws and of the language of America, were liable to be held in a state of bondage; and by the transportation system in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land; all these supplies of labour depended on a kind of slavery. Every scheme of the sort, that did not establish a kind of slavery, has failed the moment it was tried. On the principle of the *redemptioner* system, that of payment by a capitalist for the poor immigrant's passage, re-payment being obtained by the immigrant's labour, many schemes have been tried, and have failed, in Canada, New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land and South Africa; not to mention the Swan River. And yet nothing can be more plain than that the capitalists of a colony and the

labourers of an old country would find it for their mutual advantage to act on this principle. About the advance by the capitalist there is no sort of difficulty; so much greater would be to him the value of the poor immigrant's labour for a few years, even at high wages, than the cost of the immigrant's passage. Nor is there any difficulty in finding poor labourers willing, nay eager, to engage with colonial capitalists for a certain term of service in the colony. The difficulty lies in this; that without some kind of slavery, the capitalist has no security for repayment of his outlay; that the labourer, as soon as he reaches the colony, laughs at his engagement; that what the capitalist brings to the colony in the shape of labour, ceases to be labour the moment it reaches the colony; or, at all events, is never labour over which he who paid for it has any control. During the last fifteen years, some thousands of poor labourers, to speak within compass, have been conveyed from England to English colonies at the expense of colonial capitalists, and under engagement to work for those who had paid for their passage. "There is no instance on record," says Mr. M'Arthur, the greatest capitalist of New South Wales, "where settlers have been able to prevent their *indented servants*, hired in England from becoming dissatisfied, and then leaving them after their arrival." At the Swan River, the first settlers had hardly landed before the governor

was required to punish *indented labourers* for refusing to work for those who had brought them from England. In Canada, universally, labouring servants taken from England and Ireland by capitalists, under engagement to repay with labour the cost of their passage, have quitted those to whom they were bound, to work for others, who, not having laid out money in that way, could afford to pay higher wages than those who had. If it had been possible to enforce such contracts, what Canadian would have written: "Place us on an equal footing with New South Wales, by giving us a share in those benefits which must, more or less, accrue from convict labour?"* In vain have severe laws been passed to enforce the observance of such contracts by the labourer, and to prevent such immigrants from being employed except by those who had paid for their immigration. It has been all so thoroughly in vain, that the difficulty, not to say impossibility, of conducting immigration in this way, seems to be established.

To meet this difficulty, an ingenious writer in the *Quarterly Review*† has proposed to create a colonial fund for the immigration of labour, by means of a tax on wages. Thus the poor labourer

* Suggestions on the propriety of re-introducing British Convict Labour into British North America. By a Canadian, 1824.

† Presumed to be Mr. Powlett Scrope.

brought to the colony would repay the cost of his passage by a deduction from his wages; and the fund so raised would be employed in bringing more labourers, who, in their turn, would repay the cost of their passage, and provide a fund for the immigration of other labourers. The principle of this suggestion is excellent; but is the execution of it more practicable than the enforcement of contracts for service, which are based on the same principle? Unless the price of new land were raised up to the golden mean, there would be scarce any hired labour to tax; scarce any wages from which to make a deduction. But supposing the poor immigrants should, during a certain period, work for high wages, how is the tax-gatherer to distinguish workmen, whose passage had been paid for them, from those who had paid for their own passage, or from those born in the colony? If very severe laws have failed to hold immigrant labourers to their engagements, what law could be devised that would induce them to remain subject to a deduction from their wages? In a word, the scheme appears to be impracticable.

This scheme may have been suggested to its author by the proposal of the *Colonization Society**. Their proposal was, That, no waste land

* The number of the *Quarterly Review*, in which this scheme was proposed, appeared not long after the publication of *A Letter from Sydney*; in which the impossibility of holding ap-

being disposed of by the government except by public sale at a fixed upset price, all the purchase-money should be employed in bringing poor labourers to the colony. As labourers brought to the colony in this way would in time, ninety-nine out of a hundred of them, purchase land with savings from their wages; and as this deduction from their wages would be employed to bring more labourers, who, in their turn, would save money and buy land, the proposal of the Society may be said to be founded on the same principle as the suggestion of the *Quarterly Review*; namely, the repayment by the immigrant's labour of the cost of his passage. But over that suggestion the proposal of the Society has some great advantages, which will become manifest as we examine the plan more closely.

1. This plan would be very easily carried into effect. The experience of the United States shows, that it is very easy to raise a fund by the sale of waste land. Not to reckon how much larger the fund raised in that way by the United States would be, if the price of new land were brought up to the golden mean, and if no exceptional grants were made, the Americans do actually raise by the sale of waste land near £700,000. a year. What could be more easy than for the United States to spend this income in fetching labour to

prenticed labourers to their engagements was explained at length.

America? We have only to suppose that Congress should chuse to do this, and we suppose the plan of the English *Colonization Society* carried into effect without any sort of difficulty.*

* The most simple method of laying out the Immigration fund would, probably, be the formation of a Board of Immigration, instructed to make open contracts with ship-owners for the passage of labourers from Europe to America; to the amount in each year of the immigration fund obtained in the previous year; and at a certain rate for each labourer landed *in good health* at the port named in the contract. When the English government first sent convicts to New South Wales, they used to contract with shipowners for the passage of convicts, at the rate of so much per head for the number *embarked*. As the captain was to feed the convicts during their voyage, it was for his interest that they should be sickly, or that they should die. Under these contracts, accordingly, half, and sometimes two-thirds, of the inmates of a convict ship used to die during the voyage. The punishment of transportation was, in at least half the cases, the punishment of death. It was not till this murderous system had been pursued for some years, that the English government discovered the faulty nature of those contracts. At present, the rate of mortality on board convict ships is said to be lower than the rate of mortality amongst the English nobility. How was this change brought about? Simply by contracting, instead of for the number embarked, for the number *landed in the colony*. As the captain or ship owner is now paid only for those who reach their destination, it is greatly for his interest to keep all the passengers in good health. Contracts under which the shipowner was paid only for those who were landed in good health, the state of each passenger's health being ascertained by medical officers in the colony, would be a better security for the well being of the immigrants during their passage, than all

2. Pursuing this case, for the sake of more ready illustration, the disposal of this fund in this way would bring to the United States in the first year (reckoning the cost of each immigrant's passage to be £7.,) 100,000 labourers. But, as the income, which the United States obtain by the sale of waste land, has been steadily increasing for years, along with the increase of people by births and immigration, so would that fund increase much more rapidly, if each year's income were employed in bringing to the United States people who must otherwise have remained at home. The added labour of 100,000 persons in one year would provide the means of purchasing land to meet the wants of a population so growing in numbers; would provide a fund for the next year's immigration, corresponding with the additional demand for labour arising from the increase of capital, and of land the property of individuals. According to the extent of land sold, would be the increase of demand for labour wherewith to cultivate the new land; and according to the extent of land sold, would be the amount of the fund for procuring fresh labour. Supposing a fund for immigration to be got in some other way than by the sale of new land; as, for example, by a tax in the old country, or by a tax on wages in the colony, there would be no

those minute enactments which the English parliament has made for the regulation of emigrant ships.

measure for suiting the supply of labour to the demand. Too much immigrant labour might be introduced at one time, and too little at another. If the supply were not in some way regulated by the demand, all kinds of evils would ensue. Unless the supply were regular, unless those who should become landowners were replaced immediately by new comers, the same obstacles would exist, that exist now, to the commencement of works which require the constant employment of many hands; and thus, when a great supply of labourers should arrive, employment for them might be wanting. Gluts of labour, arising from uncertain immigration, do frequently happen in Canada and the State of New York. The cause of these gluts is explained by Mr. Tennant in a letter to Mr. Senior. He says—"I have conversed upon this point with capitalists both of Quebec and New York; and I have often heard them explain the circumstance in this way. 'Notwithstanding,' (say they) 'our having capital wherewith to employ labour, we have found such immigrations of labour a great evil; because we felt that it would be impossible to *retain* such labour if we had hired it. Our capital was ready for many operations which require a considerable period of time for their completion; but we could not begin such operations with labour which, we knew, would soon leave us. If we had been sure of retaining the labour of such emigrants, we

should have been glad to have engaged it at once, and for a high price: and we should have engaged it, even though we had been sure it would leave us, *provided we had been sure of a fresh supply whenever we might need it.*'" "From these and other facts," says Mr. Tennant, "it may be safely inferred, that the cause of the gluts of labour in Canada and New York might be removed by rendering the supply constant and regular; thus permitting a much greater supply in the course of ten years, without distress, than has ever yet taken place in a similar period with distress." Now, by the plan of the *Colonization Society*, the supply of labour *must* be constant and regular: because, first, as no labourer would be able to procure land until he had worked for money, all immigrant labourers, working for a time for wages and in combination, would produce capital for the employment of more labourers; secondly, because every labourer who left off working for wages and became a landowner, would, by purchasing land, provide a fund for bringing fresh labour to the colony.

Still, it may be said, this rule for avoiding at all times any glut of labour would be obtained, even if the fund for immigration were raised by the old country, provided no land were granted save upon payment of the proper price; because, in that case, all labourers would be employed for a time in creating capital for the employment of

more labourers, and thus the demand for fresh labour in any given year would always be equal to the supply of immigrant labour in the previous year. Agreed; but here there would be no rule for a sufficient supply of labour: the evil of too great a supply would be avoided, but not the evil of too small a supply; because nothing would show plainly to what extent the demand for labour had increased. Nothing, at least, would show this half so distinctly as the amount of land sold. We might, indeed, regulate the supply of labour by the amount of land sold, even if the labour were brought by a fund raised out of the colony; that is, the old country might spend, on the emigration of labour to the colony in one year, a sum precisely equal to the sum raised in the previous year by the sale of colonial land. But the object of so measuring one fund by the other would be secured, as a matter of course, if the whole fund obtained by the sales of land were spent in procuring labour. One of the greatest merits of this plan, therefore, seems to consist in its self-regulating action.

3. We have seen already, that it would be greatly for the advantage of a colony to put one price upon all new land without exception, if merely with a view to the increase of the first element of wealth, land, in due proportion to the increase of the other elements, capital and labour; that by requiring this price, as a rule for the supply of

new land, the colonists, being sufficiently kept together, would raise more produce, would get higher profits and wages, would have more physical enjoyments, to say nothing of their escape from the moral evils of great dispersion; and that, consequently, it would be well to put the best price upon all new land, even though the money so raised should not be employed in any useful way. Under the supposition of the money being wasted, the buyer of land would pay for justice and uniformity in the disposal of land, and for a free choice as to the situation and extent of his grant; he would pay also for the assurance that no other could obtain land by favour, without payment, for the certainty of not being undersold by landowners who had obtained their property for nothing; he would pay for all the advantages of that *system*, of which his individual payment was a part. But if the money were not wasted, he would pay, besides, though paying no more, for whatever useful purpose the money might serve. If the money were spent in procuring labour, he would pay, not merely for his title to the land bought, but also for justice and uniformity in the disposal of new land, for a free choice, for the value conferred upon all land by a due concentration of the people, for a system which must hinder ruinous fluctuations in the value of land; and further, he would pay for labour wherewith to cultivate his land, for markets in which to sell the produce of that labour, for population, which must render the whole of his land subject to one or more of those higher kinds of competition which lead to the payment of rent. Nominally, he would receive for his outlay—land, or the title to hold and sell land: in reality, he would obtain the land for nothing; paying for a great number of other things, without any of which his land might be worthless; along with all of which, it must, no sooner than it was bought, be worth more than he had paid for it. This paradox may be explained away in a moment. Mr. Peel, required to invest 1*s.* 6*d.* per acre on his grant of 500,000 acres, appeared to pay 37,500*l.* for that tract of land. But he made the investment, which was to secure his title, in taking labourers to the settlement. Whether the government had bestowed the land on the condition that the grantee should spend 37,000*l.* in conveying labourers to the settlement, or had sold the grant for 37,000*l.*, spending the money in that way, would have been perfectly indifferent: in either case, the grantee would have paid, not for land, but for labour; he would have received the land for nothing, but subject to the condition of buying so much labour wherewith to cultivate it. The average cost of clearing waste land in Canada and the northern parts of the United States, is about 4*l.* per acre. No land,

it is plain, ought to be granted to remain uncleared. Now suppose that the government should require 4*l.* per acre for such land, using the money to clear the land: in this case, for what would the grantee pay? not for the land, but for having it cleared. So in the case before us, the grantee would pay for the means of cultivating his land, and for the value which that disposal of his purchase money must bestow upon his land, rather than for the land itself.

4. It follows that, in justice to all the buyers of land, in order that the supply of labour should correspond exactly with the quantity of land granted, in order to give to all of the grantees the greatest return for their purchase money, it would be necessary to employ the whole of the fund, obtained by sales of land, in fetching labour to the colony. If any part of that fund were employed in any other way, neither would there be a rule for suiting the supply of labour to the demand, nor would the purchasers of land receive as much as possible for their money. The necessity, in order to make the system perfect, of avoiding any exceptional disposal of this money, is as clear as the necessity of refusing exceptional grants for the sake of a good rule by which to grant and withhold land. This will be still more clear, when we shall look at the circumstances which would guide the government in fixing on

the best price for land; a consideration reserved till now, for the reason that will appear in the next paragraph.

5. According to the value of the thing purchased, ought to be the purchase-money. The land bought would be more, much more, valuable, if the purchase-money were employed in adding to the colonial population, than if it were used for any other purpose whatever. By how much more valuable we cannot determine exactly; but this is quite plain, that for land, of which all the purchase money was devoted to the increase of colonial population, a higher price might properly be required than for land, of which the purchase-money was wasted, or was used in any way less calculated, than the use of it as an immigration fund, to increase the value of land. Thus, in America, those who last year paid 700,000*l.* for new land, might, with greater advantage to themselves, have paid twice the amount, or 1,400,000*l.* for the same extent of land, if the larger sum had been employed in adding 200,000 souls to the population of the United States. Thus the *Canada Company*, which has paid, or engaged to pay, to the English government 304,000*l.* for waste land in Upper Canada, might have paid twice as much for the same land with greater profit, if all their purchase money had been employed in adding to the population of the colony;*

* The money hitherto paid by this Company has been dis-

and if no land had been granted to other people save for money, and all the money so obtained had been employed in the same way. Let us suppose that by this employment of the purchase money of new land, the cost of clearing land were reduced from 4*l.* to 2*l.* per acre; without any fall of wages, merely from the greater facility of employing many hands in combination. In this case, which would be better for the American settler, to pay 4*l.* 5*s.* per acre for his land when cleared, that is 5*s.* for the title and 4*l.* for the clearing; or to pay 2*l.* 10*s.* for the land when cleared, that is 10*s.* instead of 5*s.* for the title, and 2*l.* instead of 4*l.* for the clearing? Like illustrations of the advantage which the buyer would derive from paying more, if his purchase money were used in the way proposed, will occur to every one. This, then, is a most important consideration, with a view to determining the best price for new land. Some others appear scarcely less important.

To clear the land of wood, a certain amount of labour per acre is required. The purchase-money of the land, then, ought to be sufficient to provide such an addition to the labouring population as would enable the proprietor to clear his

posed of in various jobs; for some account of which, see the evidence of Mr. Wilmot Horton, who helped to dispose of the money, before the Committee of the House of Commons on the Civil Government of Canada.

land, without causing a deficiency of labour in any other part of the colony: it ought to be sufficient to provide a fresh supply of labour, corresponding with the new demand which the acquisition of so much new land had produced.

If the waste land were already clear of wood, and naturally in a state fit for cultivation, as throughout the plains of Buenos Ayres, the prairies of North America and great part of Australia, the cost of clearing would be saved: the land would be worth more, by the cost of clearing, than land which required to be cleared. The produce of any given amount of capital and labour on the clear land would be greater, or would be got sooner, than the produce of the same amount of capital and labour employed on thickly wooded land. It would appear, therefore, that for land clear by nature, a higher price might properly be required than for thickly wooded land; a price higher by the cost of clearing. On the same ground, we shall conclude that a higher price might be required for land naturally rich than for land naturally poor: and if all the land in each colony were of the same quality, this consideration might be a guide towards ascertaining the best price for each colony. But the land of all countries is more or less of different qualities; and yet it is hard to learn with any precision, concerning waste land, which parts will prove, on being cultivated, more or less fer-

tile. If this distinction could be made with precision, then might there be two or more prices for land in the same colony, without any departure from the rule of uniformity; just as gold of different degrees of fineness might, under one standard, be made to pass for different values. But unable to make this distinction, how would the government require for each different portion of land its proper price? how avoid requiring too little for the rich land, or too much for the poor land? The following is one way, suggested by the practice of the United States, by which, it appears to me, this object might be accomplished. Take the richer land as the guide; ascertain what would be the best price if all the land were of the same quality as the richer portions; and let this be the lowest upset price at which any land should be sold. Then open the land to buyers. The first buyers in any district would neglect the poorer land, would select the richer lots; which, being put up to auction at the minimum price, would fetch whatever competition should determine. Very soon, however, if the upset price of these richer lots had been high enough, the poorer lots, which had been neglected, would acquire from circumstances of position, from the neighbourhood of roads and markets, from competition for the use of land on other accounts than on account of superior natural fertility, a value equal to that of the richer lots when they belonged to the

desert. By then, buyers would apply for those poorer lots at the minimum price; and they would be put up to auction, fetching the upset price or whatever competition might determine.

In all cases there would be, though a general, still an unerring guide, by which to avoid requiring too high a price; namely, the rates of profit and wages in the colony. If these should be falling, and it should be seen that the fall arose from the competition of capital with capital and of labourers with labourers, then might the government see that the price required was too high. If on the contrary, it were seen that the fall arose from the less productiveness of capital and labour, in consequence of less skill in the application of capital and labour, in consequence of the weakness arising from greater dispersion, then it would be plain that the price of new land was not high enough. The most ignorant government could hardly fail to distinguish between these two mischievous alterations in the proportion amongst the elements of production; between these two opposite causes of a fall in the rates of profits and wages.

Though it appear difficult to say which would be worse, so excessively high a price as should inflict on the colony the evils of an old country, or so excessively low a price as, along with perfect liberty of appropriation at that very low price, would scatter the people so as to render

them poor and barbarous; although there be little room to chuse between these two ways of stopping colonization, still on one ground it would appear better to make the upset price too low rather than too high. If it were made too high, it could not be reduced without injustice to those who had paid the highest price; but if it were too low, it might be raised, not only without injustice to previous buyers, but with great advantage to them. If the price were too high and were gradually lowered down to the golden mean, there would be mischievous fluctuations in the value of land: if the price, being too low, were gradually raised up to the golden mean, there would be a constant increase, but no fluctuation, in the value of land. An important rule, therefore, for getting at the best price, is to begin with a price obviously too low; taking care, however, that it be not so low as to defeat all the objects with which any price is required.*

* The English government makes five shillings per acre the upset price of waste land in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. With perfect liberty of appropriation at this price, it may be doubted whether the new plan, instead of checking, will not rather promote, the appropriation of more land than is good for the whole society. In those colonies, the caution of the local governments in the disposal of new land, if that may be termed caution which had a corrupt object; the exertion of their power in withholding new land, so that they might exert their power in granting new land with

6. When the fund for removing people is provided by the mother-country, the difference between the cost of a short and a long passage naturally directs the stream of emigration to the colonies which are nearest; but if an immigration fund were provided by the sale of colonial land at the proper price, colonies at a great distance from their mother-country would be as well supplied with labour as those which were less distant. In that case, the only effect of the difference between the cost of a short and a long passage, would be a difference, not in the manner, but in the rapidity, of colonization. For instance, supposing the cost of passage from England to Canada to be 7*l.*, and from England to Australia to be 17*l.*, and that the price of new land in both colonies were 1*l.* per acre, the sale of 100 acres in Canada would provide for the passage of 14 immigrants, while the sale of 100 acres in Australia would provide for the passage of all but 6 immigrants. A different proportion, then, between land and people would exist in these two colonies. But if the price of 1*l.* per acre, with 7*l.* for the cost of passage, should give the right proportion

advantage to their favourites, has operated as a restriction on the appropriation of new land. This restriction is removed by the plan of selling at a fixed price to all who apply; and, though this plan will put an end to injustice, it will, if the price be too low, cause a worse, instead of a better, proportion between land and people.

between land and people, then it would be clear that, with 17*l.* for the cost of passage, 1*l.* per acre was too low a price for new land. In order that there should be, in the two colonies, one proportion between land and people, it would be necessary either to reduce the price of new land in Canada, so that for each 100 acres sold there should be only 6 immigrants, or to raise the price of new land in Australia, so that there should be 14 immigrants for each 100 acres sold. We are to presume, that in both cases the price of land would be such as to maintain a due proportion between land and people. If so, though the price of land would be higher in the more distant colony, that colony would be as well supplied with labour as the nearer colony, as well supplied, that is, in proportion to the demand for labour; colonization would go on as well as in the nearer colony; and the only difference would be, as the result of greater distance and greater cost of passage, that the waste land of the distant colony would not be bought and cultivated quite so rapidly as that of the nearer colony.

This difference, however, would not be inevitable in all cases. Cases might happen, in which colonization should proceed as rapidly in the more distant colony as in the nearer one. This would happen if, the land of the two colonies being of equal natural fertility, that of the nearer colony were thickly wooded and that of the

more distant colony were already fit for cultivation; as is actually the case with respect to Canada and Australia. If waste land were sold at the proper price in both colonies, a higher price being required for the land which, being clear of timber, was more valuable, then what the more distant colony should save, in consequence of her land being clear by nature, would go to swell her immigration fund. The difference might be so great as that the more distant colony should have a greater immigration fund, and a stronger power of attraction, than the nearer colony.

7. Another part of the proposal of the *Colonization Society* remains to be examined. Supposing the money obtained by the sale of land to be spent on immigration, this fund ought, clearly, to be spent in the most economical way; in the way, by which the good to be obtained by that outlay should be as great as possible. If the object were to procure, at the least cost, the greatest amount of labour for immediate employment, it would appear, at first sight, that the immigrants brought to the colony ought to be, all of them, males in the prime of life. But it is only at first sight that this can appear; because on reflection it will be seen, that two men having to perform each for himself all the offices that women usually perform for men; to cook his own victuals, to mend his own clothes, to make his own

bed, to play the woman's part at home as well as the man's part in the field or workshop; it will be seen, I say, that two men, each of whom should be obliged so to divide his labour between household cares and the work of production, would produce less than one man giving the whole of his time, attention and labour, to the work of production. If the two men should combine their labour and divide their employments, one occupying himself solely with household cares for both, and the other solely with earning wages for both, then might the produce of their united labour be as great as that of one married man; but in no case could it be more. In new colonies, men have often made this unnatural arrangement; because all modern colonies, at least, have been founded by a number of men greatly exceeding the number of women who accompanied them. We need not stop to look at the moral evils of this excess of males. Economically speaking, it seems quite plain, the poor immigrants brought to a colony by the purchase money of waste land, ought to be men and women in equal numbers; and if married, so much the better.

If they were old people their labour would be of little value to the colony; not only because it would soon be at an end; but also because they would be weak, and because they would not readily turn their hands to new employments, to

employments very often quite different from those in which they had worked from their childhood to old age. In order that the poor immigrants brought to a colony should be as valuable as possible, they ought to be young people, whose powers of labour would last as long as possible, and who would readily turn their hands to new kinds of work.

But would there be any objection to a mixture of children? To this there would be four objections. First, if the children were the offspring of grown up immigrants, it would follow that the latter were not of the best age; that if old enough to have children, they were too old to come under the description of the *most* valuable labourers. Secondly, children are less fit than old people, even, to undergo, the confinement and other troubles of a long sea voyage.* Thirdly,

* To be convinced of this, let any one visit a ship full of emigrants, in the Thames or the Mersey, bound to Canada. He will find those who are parents, troubled and anxious, fearful of accidents to their children, restless, starting at every noise; if paupers, glad to see their little ones stuffing themselves with the ship's rations, dainties to them, poor little wretches, who have plenty to eat for the first time in their lives; if paupers, looking back without affection, and with hope to the future, but, being parents, with apprehension lest in the distant and unknown land of promise, the children should suffer more than they have endured at home. He will see the children, if paupers, delighted at meal times, smiling with greasy lips, their eyes sparkling over the butcher's meat, but, at other times,

when children first reach a colony, they necessarily incumber somebody. Fourthly, they cannot for some time be of any use as labourers: they cannot produce capital wherewith to attract and employ other labourers. To whatever extent, then, the colonial fund should be employed in bringing children, instead of grown up people, the value received by the colony for its outlay would be less than need be. By bringing none but young grown up persons, the maximum of value would be obtained for any given outlay.

But this is not all. The greatest quantity of labour would be obtained more easily than a less quantity. The natural time of marriage is a time of change, when two persons, just united for life, must, nearly always, seek a new home. The natural time of marriage too is one, when the mind is most disposed to hope, to ambition, to under-

sick of the confinement, tired of having nothing to do, wanting a play-place, always in the way, driven from pillar to post, fretful, quarrelsome, thoroughly unhappy, and exposed to serious accidents. Those emigrants, on the contrary, who are neither parents nor children, young men and women without any incumbrance; these he will find quite at their ease, enjoying the luxury of idleness, pleased with the novelty of their situation, in a state of pleasurable excitement, building castles in the air, glorying in the prospect of independence, thanking God that they are still without children, and, if he knows how to make them speak out, delighted to talk of the new country, in which as they have heard, children, instead of being a burthen, are the greatest of blessings.

takings which require decision and energy of purpose. Marriage produces greater anxiety for the future, and a very strong desire to be better off in the world for the sake of expected offspring. Of what class are composed those numerous streams of emigrants, which flow continually from the eastern to the outside of the western states of America, by channels longer and rougher than the sea-way from England to the eastern states? Not of single men, nor of old people, nor of middle-aged parents dragging children along with them, but, for the most part, of young couples, just married, seeking a new home, fondly assisting and encouraging each other, strong in health and spirits; not driven from their birth-place by fear of want, but attracted to a new place, by the love of independence, by a sentiment of ambition, and most of all perhaps, by anxiety for the welfare of children to come. This, then, is the class of people, that would be most easily attracted to a colony by high wages, and still better prospects. Others would be willing to come if, the old country co-operating with the colony, all in the old country were well informed of the advantages of emigration: but these would be the most willing; these would be, not merely willing, but anxious to come.

Of these, however, there might not exist in an old country a sufficient number to meet the colonial demand for labour. For example, if the

United States should propose to lay out 1,400,000*l.* a year in bringing young couples from Ireland, this would produce a demand for 100,000 young Irish couples; but in Ireland there are not so many as 100,000 couples of the same age. There are not, perhaps, in Ireland more than 60,000 grown up young couples who were born in the same year. As the constant emigration of all, or may-be of half, the couples, who every year reach the age of puberty, must very soon depopulate any country, we may be sure that a portion only of this class would ever be disposed to emigrate. Whenever a number sufficient to meet the colonial demand for labour should not be disposed to emigrate, it would be right to offer a passage cost free to couples older by one, two or three years, but always giving a preference to those who had most lately reached the age of puberty. Indeed, as to those of the best possible age, we can only say that it would be right to give them a preference.

Supposing all the people brought to the colony with the purchase-money of waste land to be young men and women, in equal numbers, let us see what the effect would be on the colonial population. At the end of twenty years after the foundation of Virginia, the number of colonists was about 1800; though, during the twenty years, near 20,000 persons had reached the settlement. This rapid decrease of population was, as I have

endeavoured to show elsewhere,* owing chiefly to the misery of the colonists; but it was partly owing, also, to this; that of the 20,000 immigrants a very small proportion only consisted of females. So that, even if the colony had prospered from the beginning, the number of colonists would probably have been less at the end of twenty years than the number of immigrants during that period. The settlement of New South Wales has so far prospered from the beginning, that no one has ever found it difficult to maintain a family: yet the population of the colony is nothing like as great as the number of immigrants. But why? simply because, of those persons, by far the greater number were men, and that, of the women, who composed the smaller number, many were past the age of child-bearing. Had those persons consisted of men and women in equal proportions, but of a middle age, the population of the colony might not have been much greater than it is; but if they had consisted entirely of young couples, who had just reached the age of puberty, the population of the colony would have advanced with surprising rapidity. Reckoning the number of immigrants in each year at 2,000, there seem to be grounds for believing† that, if all these had been young couples

* See Note X.

† Amongst these grounds are the very healthy climate of New South Wales, and the great fecundity of women in that

just arrived at the age of puberty, the population of the colony would by this time have amounted to nearly 500,000, instead of its actual amount, less than 50,000; that the progress of population and we may add, of colonization, would have been ten times as great as it has been, with the same outlay for bringing people to the colony. At present too, the proportion of young people in New South Wales is rather under than over the usual rate; whereas, in the supposed case, the proportion of young people would have been very much greater than it has ever been in any human society. According, of course, to this great proportion of young people would have been the prospect of future increase. If all the people who have removed from Europe to America had been young couples, just arrived at the age of puberty, slavery in North America must long since have died a natural death: no part of North America, no part of South America,* perhaps, would have been open for colonization. Considering what must, almost inevitably, have happened in this

country. Mr. Cunningham states that in the settlement of Bathurst Plains, a new colony, west of the Blue Mountains, only one natural death occurred in twelve years.

* As it is, there are some reasons for expecting that South America, where the greatest pains have been taken to disperse the people, and render them as barbarous as the Indians, will be colonized over again by emigrants from the north, who, kept together by the density of the natural forest, have preserved the power of civilization.

case, it seems hard to overrate the advantages within reach of the United States, by means of colonizing their waste territory in the way proposed.

In any colony, the immediate effect of selecting young couples for immigration would be to diminish very much the ordinary cost of adding to the population of the colony. The passage of young couples would not cost more than that of any other class, or of all classes mixed; but, along with the young couples, the colony would obtain, at the ordinary cost, the greatest possible germ of future increase. The settlers in New South Wales who, in the course of a few years, have made that colony to swarm with sheep, did not import lambs or old sheep; still less did they import a large proportion of rams. They have imported altogether a very small number of sheep, compared with the vast number now in the colony. Their object was the production in the colony of the greatest number of sheep by the importation of the least number, or, in other words, at the least cost; and this object they accomplished by selecting for importation those animals, which, on account of their sex and age, were fit to produce the greatest number of young in the shortest time. If a like selection were made of the persons to be brought to a colony with the purchase-money of waste land, the land bought, it is evident, would become as valuable

as it could ever become, much more quickly than if the immigrants should be a mixture of persons of all ages. In the former case, not only would the immigrants be, all of them, of the most valuable class as labourers, but they would be of a class fit to produce the most rapid increase of people in the colony; to create as soon as possible in places now desert a demand for food, for the raw materials of manufactures, for accommodation land and for building ground. The buyer of new land, therefore, would have his purchase-money laid out for him in the way best of all calculated to be of service to him. It would be well to consider this, in seeking to determine the proper price for new land, of which the purchase-money was to be thus laid out for the greatest advantage of the purchaser.

It must be seen, further, that if the immigration fund were laid out in this way, the progressive increase of that fund, by means of the increase of people wanting land, would be much more rapid than if the immigrants brought to the colony were of all ages mixed. By adopting this mode of immigration, all the means of colonization would be used with their greatest possible effect.*

* By the importunity of some members of the *Colonization Society*, the English government was induced to adopt this principle of colonization. While their Board of Emigration was sitting in Downing Street, a mere name for want of funds,

The moral advantages of such a selection of immigrants would not be few. Each female would

they were persuaded to devote the money obtained by the sale of waste land in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land to the sending of poor females to those colonies. It was high time to do something towards correcting the disproportion between the sexes which exists in those colonies. Several ship loads of poor females have, in this way, been provided with a passage to the penal settlements. But with what result? The number of female immigrants is not, by any means, sufficient to cause an equal proportion between the sexes. So long as the proportion shall remain unequal, all females, not protected by a higher station, must be subject to a kind of persecution which one need not describe. It is enough to say, that the government, sending so few, has sent a certain number of women from England to become prostitutes in Australia. While the government was sending these women, it sent, side by side with these women, though not in the same ships, a greater number of men; as if determined to miss the object with which the women were sent. At first, the colonial office declared in print, that the passage of the women was to be paid for with the money obtained by selling waste land. This was acknowledging a new and important principle. Whether alarmed at finding themselves connected with something new and important, something not common-place, something out of the routine of office; or whether they discovered that the fund to be obtained by selling waste land would be very handy for their own private purposes; with what motive I know not; but by a new regulation of the colonial office, it is declared that the cost of sending women to the penal settlements will be defrayed out of the *colonial revenue*. Thus the fund obtained by the sale of waste land has been carried to the governor's account; and the principle of using that fund for bringing labour to the colony has been abandoned. Mr. Wilmot Hor-

have a special protector from the moment of her departure from home. No man would have any excuse for dissolute habits. All the evils, which have so often sprung from a disproportion between the sexes, would be avoided. Every pair of immigrants would have the strongest motives for industry, steadiness and thrift. In a colony thus peopled, there would scarcely ever be any single men or single women: nearly the whole population would consist of married men and women, boys and girls, and children. For many years, the proportion of children to grown up people would be greater than was ever known since Shem, Ham and Japhet were surrounded by their little ones. The colony would be an immense nursery, and, all being at ease without being scattered, would offer the finest opportu-

ton used to contend, that whatever "the crown" might obtain by the sale of waste land was the property of "the crown;" and that touching the disposal of it, no one had any business to enquire, any more than about the disposal of secret service money voted by parliament. The change has taken place since Lord Howick, who in parliament thought fit to acknowledge the services of the *Colonization Society*, gave up the "Australian department" of the colonial office to his colleague Mr. Hay; once the colleague of Mr. Horton, and always, if I am not greatly mistaken, one of that party, whom the *Standard* newspaper calls "the Peel and Dawson crew." If Mr. Hay be the author of this change, his motives for bringing it about may, perhaps, be discovered in a correspondence printed in the Appendix, No. 3.

nity that ever occurred, to see what may be done for society by universal education. That must be a narrow breast in which the last consideration does not raise some generous emotion.

This is the way in which the *Colonization Society* proposed that the purchase money of waste land should be employed. The sum of the measures suggested by them, having regard to the objects and means of the colonies alone, is: The sale of *all* waste land by public auction at a fixed upset price, with the most perfect liberty of appropriation at that price: and the employment of *the whole* of the fund so obtained in bringing people to the colony; a preference being always given to young couples who have just reached the age of puberty. How the mother-country, the country, that is, from which the immigrants should come, might usefully co-operate with the colony, remains to be considered.

CO-OPERATION OF THE MOTHER-COUNTRY.

The subject has been thus divided for two reasons; first because, as observed already, it was more convenient to take a colonial view of means which exist in the colony; secondly, in order to show clearly, without any long explanation, that under a good system of colonization, by whatever government administered, people would be drawn to the colony, not driven from the mother-country. By examining the subject in this way,

any one may see distinctly, that the advantage of those who shall remove from the mother-country is a necessary condition of emigration; that emigration to any considerable extent could not take place without benefit to the emigrants. This, however, is not the general impression in England. A different impression has been made on the English vulgar, high and low. Never having heard of emigration, save, according to Mr. Wilmot Horton's views, as a means of relief from the pressure of the poor's-rate, they have supposed that, whether or not the object were attained, the poor emigrants must be driven away for the good of those who should remain behind, instead of being drawn away for their own good. This impression, which renders the word emigration distasteful to the English, seems to have been caused by three circumstances in particular.

First. By various attempts to raise in the mother-country a fund for pauper emigration, not the good of the emigrants, but that of the subscribers to the fund, was made prominent. Thus, when the government advanced 60,000*l.* for sending some poor people to Canada, it was supposed that the government wished to get rid of those people, not for their sake, but for the sake of those to whom the people were a burthen. So also, when Lord Howick brought a bill into parliament for enabling parishes to raise an emigration fund by mortgaging their poor's-rate, the

advantage, not of the paupers, but of the rate-payers, was supposed to be his object. If the money employed in the first case had been provided under the name of a grant to Upper Canada, for supplying that colony with labour, the English government would have appeared to consult, not its own advantage but that of the colony; and the advantage of the poor emigrants, the certainty of their obtaining high wages, would have been set in a prominent light: the low and high vulgar would have seen that labour was wanted in the colony: and thus it would have appeared, not that the emigrants were driven from home, but that they were invited to another place. As it was, the simple truth, that when, in the natural progress of colonization, people quit their birth-place, they must necessarily be invited by the prospect of advantage to themselves; this evident truth was kept out of view; and in its room an impression was made that the poor emigrants might suffer by their removal.

Secondly. Under the experiments in pauper emigration made by the English government, poor emigrants *have* suffered by their removal. To say nothing of what happened to the poor people whom the English government sent to South Africa, the poor people whom they sent to Canada suffered great privations and hardships. They consisted of families, men, women and swarms of children; and, what is more important,

instead of being allowed to proceed in a natural course, that is, to remain in the settled parts of the colony, working for wages, getting assistance when required from their employers and neighbours, and learning by degrees how to settle in the forest; instead of this, they were planted at once beyond the settled parts of the colony, in the midst of the forest, far apart from each other, without experience, assistance or advice; and even without houses in which to shelter their families. Those English paupers, becoming suddenly colonial landlords, not hardened to the climate, placed on new land where ague generally prevails, not accustomed to use the hatchet, which is the first tool used by a settler; thus placed, like fish out of water, they suffered from heat, cold and wet, from sickness, from wounds, and finally from a sentiment of despair. Not a few of the children died. The misery which these poor people suffered, though great pains were taken to conceal it by the author of the experiment, became known in England; and thus a well-founded prejudice was created against emigration; well-founded, that is, as against this sort of emigration.* But along with a dislike to

* The absurdity of Mr. Wilmot Horton's scheme for *locating* English paupers in the forests of Canada was exposed by the *Colonization Society*; and in the emigration bill which Lord Howick soon afterwards brought into parliament, the natural mode of pauper emigration was adopted; that of allowing poor labourers to be attracted by the high wages of the colony.

this sort of emigration, there arose, as might have been expected, a dislike to all emigration.

Thirdly. The English government goes out of its way to strengthen in the common people their natural sense of the evils of emigration. As it is painful to quit for ever the country of one's birth and one's affections, so is emigration necessarily attended with some evil; but this evil, it is plain, will never be incurred voluntarily, that is, if there be no sort of interference by government, without so much good as turns the scale in favour of emigration. The balance of the account must necessarily be in favour of the voluntary emigrant. But what says the English government? While Lord Howick was vainly begging the house of commons to pass his emigration bill, imploring them to mend the condition of the peasantry in the south of England, to prevent another insurrection of that class by enabling some of them to remove to the colonies; at this very time, the judges at Winchester and elsewhere, addressed language to the following effect to peasants convicted of rioting for better wages: — Unhappy men! your crime is enormous, and your punishment must be great. The sentence of the law is, that you be transported beyond seas for the term of your natural lives. You are going to a far

country; to a country so far off, that neither will you ever hear of those whom you love best, nor will they ever hear of you. Though the law does not permit me to pass on some of you the sentence of transportation for life, still I can assure such of you, that you will never be able to return. You may have heard from wicked men like yourselves, that it is a fine country; and you may expect to do well there. But oh, unhappy prisoners! you will suffer all the pain of being for ever banished from the country of your birth and your affections. May God, in his mercy, give you fortitude to bear so dreadful a punishment, which however is no more than your atrocious crime deserves.——Hereupon, some of the prisoners, single men who had, indeed, heard that New South Wales is a very fine country, and that they could hardly fail to do well there; these put their tongues into their cheeks, and set the judge at defiance. But the wives and children of the others shed tears, shrieked or fainted; and all through those rural districts there was weeping and lamentation. These are the districts in which, especially, it was intended that Lord Howick's bill should be of use; districts in which, amongst the class who were to be persuaded to emigrate, a strong impression had been made, that emigration is the greatest punishment next to death. Are we, then, to be surprized that the English generally should look upon

every attempt by their government to promote emigration as an attempt to hurt the emigrants? So long as criminals shall be punished by transportation, there must necessarily exist in England a strong prejudice against any interference by the government for promoting emigration.

But why should the government of an old country ever undertake to promote emigration from that country, when all the ends, which an old country seeks in colonization, may be reached by promoting immigration to her colonies? Whether the colony be dependent or independent, all that the government of the mother-country has to do at home for promoting colonization, is to take care that the poorer class at home be well informed of the advantages of going to a colony; taking care also that the necessary evil of going from home be not made to appear greater than it is, through forcing people to emigrate by way of punishment. It would be very easy, indeed, supposing either that there was co-operation between the old country and the colony, or that both were under the same government, to keep the poorer class in the old country well informed of the advantages of going to a colony. The great emigration from England which took place last year, was caused mainly by the publication of letters from poor emigrants to their friends in England.* But in order that such letters should

* Thousands, probably, were induced to emigrate by reading

be published, it is necessary that they should be written and received. Why not, in order to promote the receipt of such letters among the poorer class in the mother-country, allow poor emigrants, during some years after their arrival in the colony, to send letters by the post, but free of postage, to the friends whom they had left behind; just as, in many countries, soldiers are allowed this privilege? To such an arrangement there appears no obstacle that might not be got over with very little trouble.* In this way, not only would the necessary evil of going to a colony be diminished; that is, the emigrants would depart with the pleasant assurance of being able to communicate with their friends at home; but the poorer class in the mother-country would always hear the truth as to the prospects of emigrants; and not only the truth, but truth in which they would not suspect any falsehood. The statements as to the high wages obtainable in the English colonies lately published by a board of emigration sitting in Downing

one publication of this sort; a collection of letters from poor emigrants, printed and circulated by one of the best friends of the English poor, and we may add of the rich, Mr. Poulett Scrope.

* An officer at the colonial port might give to each poor immigrant a certificate, which should authorise post-masters throughout the colony to frank letters for the mother-country that were brought to a post-office by the bearer of the certificate.

Street, though perfectly true, have not been received with implicit faith by the harassed and therefore suspicious class to whom they were addressed; nor would any statements made by the government ever obtain so much credit as letters from the emigrants themselves. In this way, moreover, the attractive power of the colony would be made apparent to the high vulgar of the mother-country; and those preachers would be silenced, whose text is, "Dwell in the land and verily ye shall be fed."

With respect to the mother-country, two points remain to be examined; first, the effect of the proposed selection of emigrants in producing relief from excessive numbers; secondly, the means by which the overflowing capital of an old country might find secure and profitable employment through this system of colonization.

First—If it be true that 125,000 persons emigrated from Great Britain and Ireland last year, still this abstraction of people has not caused the least perceptible relief from excessive numbers. That great body of emigrants consisted of a mixture of all classes; masters and servants, old and young. The poorest class was composed, in great measure of families, men, women and children, for whom a passage was provided by their parishes, with a view to get rid of them. By the removal of the children, nothing was taken from the present market of English labour; nor

indeed by the removal of any but workmen. Of these last, the number removed were too small for any effect on wages. The only effect of their removal was to make room for others quite ready to take their place. But if this great body of emigrants had consisted entirely of workmen and their wives, it seems probable that considerable relief would have been obtained from excessive numbers; that more room would have been made than could have been immediately filled by other workmen. The conscription in France, during the late war, did not, perhaps, carry off so many workmen, year by year, in proportion to the then population of France, as the proportion which 60,000 bears to 24,000,000: yet it certainly had the effect of keeping the supply of labour so much within the demand, that the condition of the labouring class in France was, during the war, very comfortable compared with what it has been since the peace. One of the causes of Napoleon's great popularity was the easy state of the labouring class in France during his reign: one of the causes of the late revolution in France was the uneasy state of the working class who effected that revolution: and the miserable state of that class, in the greater part of France at this time, leaves but small hope that the revolution which they effected will be of any service to them. In France, the working people now say, commonly:—Oh! if we could get back Napoleon we

should soon be better off.—Without knowing it, they want so much war as should again cause the fields to be tilled by women. If, for every young man carried off by Napoleon's wars, a young woman also had been carried off, though the immediate effect on the state of the working class would have been the same, the conscription would have had a more lasting effect on the condition of the working class. Millions, perhaps, who have been born in France since 1814, would not have been born there; and thus, though many would have lived, who have been born to die since 1814, if not of hunger, of disease produced by all sorts of privations, still the good effect of the conscription might have lasted till now. These considerations will direct us to a right estimate of the influence, which a proper selection of emigrants would have on the population of a country like England.

It has been reckoned,* that in England the number of marriages which take place in a year is in the proportion of 1 to about 134 souls. Assuming this calculation to be right, and the population of England to be 14,000,000, the yearly number of marriages in England is $104{,}477\frac{15}{67}$. Whatever would be the effect on population of

* See Professor M'Culloch's Note on *Population*, in his edition of the Wealth of Nations, which is full of valuable information on this subject.

preventing all the marriages, would be the effect of removing all who were about to marry. The removal, therefore, of about 209,000 persons every year for a few years would very soon depopulate England. But this effect would occur through the removal of a much smaller number. It would occur by the yearly removal of all who in each year should reach the age of puberty. How many persons in England every year reach the age of puberty has never been calculated. But it is reckoned, that the yearly births are, to the whole population, in the proportion of 1 to about 31. Taking the yearly births, then, to be $451{,}612\frac{23}{31}$, or for round numbers 450,000, and assuming that not above one third of these, or 150,000, reach the age of puberty, it appears, that England might soon be depopulated by the yearly abstraction, for some years, of a number of persons not much greater than the number who did actually emigrate last year. Supposing the emigration of each of these persons to cost 7*l.*, the cost of entirely depopulating England would be a yearly outlay, for some years, of 1,050,000*l.*; very little more by the year than a seventh part of the English poor's-rate; not much more than the supposed cost of emigration from Great Britain and Ireland during the last year. But there is a way by which, with a still smaller yearly outlay, England might be depopulated: by taking away every year a number of young couples sufficient to reduce the whole number in after years; so that the number of young couples would, in time, be reduced to one. Supposing that this might be effected, though not so quickly as if all were removed, by removing every year *half* of the young couples who had in that year reached the age of puberty, then might England be depopulated by the yearly removal for some years of 75,000 persons, at a yearly cost of 525,000*l.* The question, however, is, not how might England be depopulated, but what is the smallest proportion of young couples, whose yearly removal would prevent any hurtful increase of the population of a country like England; would put the bulk of the people at ease; enabling all to marry when nature should prompt them to marriage; preventing the death of many through want; and giving full effect to the principle of population.

Still this question is not of much, perhaps it is not of any, practical importance. By the proposed selection of emigrants, all that could be done would be done, towards procuring relief from excessive numbers; and in no event could too many people be removed; because when relief from excessive numbers was obtained, emigration would stop, until the prospect of misery from excessive numbers should again render the evil of quitting home less than that of remaining at home.

By the proposed selection of emigrants, moreover, as the greatest quantity of relief from excessive numbers would be comprised in the removal of the least number of people, the maximum of good from emigration would be obtained, not only with the minimum of cost, but what is far more important, with the minimum of painful feelings. All that old people and young children suffer more than other people from a long voyage would be avoided. Those only would remove, who were already on the move to a new home: those only, to whom, on account of their youth and animal spirits, separation from birth-place would be least painful; those only, who had just formed the dearest connection, and one not to be severed, but to be made happy, by their removal. And this, the least degree of painful feeling, would be suffered by the smallest possible number of people.

To make this selection, no interference would be required from the government of an old country. Supposing the attractive power of the colony applied to the immigration of young couples, then ship-owners and others, who had contracted with the colonial government for bringing young couples to the colony, would make known in the mother-country, that they were ready to convey to the colony, free of cost, persons of that description, but not of any other description. Suppose that a young single man should

apply for a passage; he would be told that for the passage of a single man there was no fund, but that there was a fund for the passage of a married man and his wife; that whenever he should please to return with a young wife, they might both go to the colony cost free. Can it be doubtful that he would soon return with a young wife? The experiment has been thus far tried; that when, last year, the *South Australian Land Company* received applications for a passage to New Holland, from young single men out of work, and answered, "Yes, if you get married, and for your wife also," the common reply was, "So much the better;" with a snap of the fingers, a laugh, or swimming eyes, that spoke more than the words.* In order that this selection should be made without any difficulty, all that would be required from the government of an old country is, that it should be so good as to do nothing; that it should have sense enough to abstain from meddling with the attractive power of the colony.

Secondly—There are two ways in which this system of colonization seems calculated to give secure and profitable employment to the overflowing capital of a mother-country.

* Whoever persuaded Lord Goderich to depart from his engagement with this company, little knows how much bitter disappointment he occasioned. But what are the hopes of paupers to secretaries of state?

In the first place, it is clear that, to whatever extent this system was pursued, the colonies would be more extensive; that under this system, they would be extended as rapidly as possible; and that as every new colony, or increase of an old one, would be the extension of an old society to a new place; as the colonists would produce more with the same number of hands than colonists have ever produced, and would retain the habits and wants of their mother-country; so would this mode of colonization very rapidly increase the markets in which the mother-country might buy raw produce and cheap corn with manufactured goods. One end of colonization being to enlarge the field for employing capital and labour within the mother-country, that great object would be obtained most easily and most quickly by these means of colonization.

But, in the next place, in order that this most useful process should begin as soon as possible, colonies already established, might require some assistance, not from the government, but from the capitalists of the mother-country. Suppose that the Americans, having resolved to dispose of their fund, obtained by the sale of waste land, in bringing labour to the United States, should, with a view to the extinction of slavery, with a view to obtaining immediately a sufficient supply of free labour, be willing to anticipate that fund? to borrow money on that security? Could a

better security for overflowing English capital be readily imagined? In this way, capital which is now lying idle in England, or is about to fly off, taking no labour with it, would fly off, indeed, but only for a time, and would take with it, or draw after it, a corresponding amount of surplus labour. We have only to suppose, farther, that in Canada, South Africa and Australia, the American plan of selling land had been adopted with improvements; we have only to suppose, in short, that the legislature of England had attended to this subject, and we suppose the opening of three more great fields for the secure and profitable employment of English capital in the work of colonization.

The enlargement of the field, however, need not stop here. While a portion of the capital of the mother-country was employed in anticipation of the sales of waste land, other portions would be employed in the purchase of waste land. Immense capitals, belonging to people in the eastern states of America, are constantly employed in the purchase of new land on the western frontier, and invariably, I believe, with profit to the capitalists. The profit of such purchases would be much more certain, and would be obtained much sooner, in a colony where no new land was obtainable save by purchase, and where all the purchase-money of new land was employed in bringing selected labourers to the colony. How

great and rapid might be the profit of such undertakings, may be partly conceived from the success of the *Canada Company*, of whose proceedings a brief summary appears below.* This company bought land of the government, without any assurance that land would not be given for nothing to other people; and the money which they have paid to the government has been wasted; all of it in some way, most of it in shameful jobs. Nearly all the great and successful purchases of waste land in the United States, are conducted by companies residing in the eastern towns. This kind of investment seems peculiarly suited to companies. The whole operation consists of paying and receiving money; paying a small sum, waiting, and then receiving a large sum. The time for waiting would be very short, if all the money paid were employed in adding to the colonial population, according to a fixed rule, and so that the greatest amount of

* Nominal capital, 1,000,000*l.*
Capital actually invested, 151,555*l.*
Dividend of 4 per cent. per annum, regularly paid. Assets of the company (December 1832): 1st. Bills given by purchasers of their land, bearing interest at 6 per cent., with payment by instalments effectually secured, 113,025*l.* 2nd. Land paid for by the company, but not yet sold, including the town lots of Guelph and Goderich, 460,000 acres estimated at 15*s.* per acre, or 345,000*l.* 3d. Land remaining to be paid for, 1,658,000 acres, at the rate of 2*s.* 10*d.* per acre, estimated to sell for 15*s.* per acre or 1,243,500*l.*

population was added at the least cost. It would be difficult for companies to make any serious blunder: scarce any thing would be left to the neglect of agents; for there would be scarce anything to do: and, lastly, a company by the employment of a large capital might take so much land, in one lot, or block, as would insure the formation of a town on their property; not by them, but by others for their good. Becoming the proprietors of a large extent of land, there would necessarily occur upon some parts of their property those kinds of competition for the use of land, over and above competition for land of superior natural fertility, which lead to the payment of rent: every sale by them would add to the value of land adjoining that which had been sold; and the whole business of selling might be conducted by one or two agents of common intelligence. To show how great and how sure would be the profit of such investments, under the proposed system of colonization, I have collected a number of facts, which establish that, even now, *wherever people congregate*, new land invariably rises in value soon after it becomes private property.* All surplus capital invested in this way would, of course, take off with it a corresponding amount of surplus labour. Every investment of this kind would tend, in proportion

* See Appendix, No. 2.

to its amount, to diminish in the mother-country the competition of capital with capital, and of labour with labour.

How this system of colonization would tend to enlarge the field of employment for those classes, who are not called either capitalists or labourers, is very evident. As all the emigrant labourers would retain the habits and wants of their mother-country, so would they, having plenty in the colony, create a demand for the services of those classes whose only property is their knowledge; and the progressive increase of this demand would keep pace, exactly, with the very rapid progress of colonization. Colonies that were brisk markets for the sale of goods manufactured in the mother-country, must necessarily afford employment to persons, having the common run of knowledge, or superior knowledge, who should emigrate from the mother-country. Touching this point, it is only necessary to repeat, that a colony, founded or extended in the way proposed, would be the extension of an old society to a new place, with all the good, but without the evils, which belong especially to old countries.

This exposition of the views of the *Colonization Society*, may be properly concluded by a quotation from their own statement of their principles and objects.

"To conclude: We have purposely abstained

from dwelling on the improvement which this system of colonization might effect in the moral condition of the poorer classes in Britain, or on the wonderful rapidity with which, by calling millions and hundreds of millions into existence, it might people the desert regions of the globe. Such speculations, however grateful, are unsuited to the present occasion. We have confined ourselves to statements and arguments which may be submitted to the test of rational inquiry. Any man, inquiring with a single desire to find the truth, may readily convince himself, whether or not the proposed selection of emigrants would prevent all undesirable increase of people in the mother-country, and, at the same time, cause the greatest possible increase of people in the colonies; whether or not the proposed concentration of the colonists would tend to their wealth and civilization; would furnish the greatest amount of employment for labour, and the greatest fund for conveying labour to the market. These are questions in the science of public economy which must be speedily decided. If they should be decided in the affirmative, it must inevitably follow, that the measure in question, being well administered, would save the greater part of the poor's-rate of England, and prevent in Ireland, the greater evil of pauperism without poor laws; that it would occasion a great and constant in-

crease of the demand for British manufactures; that it would extinguish slavery in South Africa, by the substitution of free labour; and that it would enable the more extensive British colonies to defray the entire cost of their own government and protection. Moreover, if the principles of the suggested measure be sound, the measure may be adopted, not only upon any scale, that is, by degrees, so as to render its adoption perfectly easy,—but also without harm to any, and with benefit to all; without the least injury to a single person, and with definable and manifest advantage, to the poor, both those who should remove and those who should remain; to the landlords, farmers, manufacturers, merchants and shipowners of Britain; to the colonists of every class, but more especially to the landowners and merchants; and finally to both the domestic and the colonial governments. We beg the reader to observe that these conclusions are stated hypothetically. The accuracy of the conclusions depends on the truth of the principles, which it is our wish rather to submit for examination than to assert with confidence. But if those conclusions should turn out to be founded on reason and truth, it will be acknowledged, that objects more important were never sought by more simple means."

THE FOUNDATION OF COLONIES.

After so full a notice of the other parts of the subject, this part of it may be disposed of in few words.

If the purchase of waste land in a colony already established were a profitable mode of employing capital, so would be the purchase of the first grant in a new colony. Nay, as the first purchasers of land in a new colony would naturally select the spot on which the first town, or the capital of the colony, the seat of government and the centre of trade, was likely to be formed, their land must necessarily, if the colony prospered at all, soon become extremely valuable. Their purchase-money would provide the colony with labour of the most valuable kind, and in due proportion to the land granted. Here, there would be no motive for anticipating by a loan the sales of waste land; because, in this case, there would never be any hurtful disproportion between land and people. The certainty of obtaining labour in the new colony would be the strongest inducement to the emigration of capitalists, ambitious to take part in laying the foundation of an empire. Thus would all the elements of wealth be brought together, with no further trouble to the government of the mother-country than what should be required for establishing in the colony a fixed and uniform system in the disposal of waste land. It

was the hope of being able to persuade the English government to establish such a system for the south coast of Australia, that lately induced a body of Englishmen* to project the foundation of a colony in that desert part of the world. A body of capitalists, sure of a rapid increase in the value of land, if all land were sold and all the purchase-money employed in procuring labour, was ready to buy a part of that wilderness; another body of capitalists, depending on a constant supply of labour, was ready to embark for that desert; the most numerous, wealthy and estimable body of Englishmen that ever proposed to found a colony: and labourers in abundance were anxious to accompany them, expecting to have their passage paid for with the purchase-money of the desert land. In order to carry this project into effect, nothing more was required than some engagement from the English government, that the proposed system for the disposal of waste land should be firmly established in the intended colony; some law, or something like a law, to prevent a colonial governor, and the clerks in Downing Street, from meddling with the disposal of waste land in this colony. The best security for this object would have been an act of

* See in the Appendix (No. 3.) a list of the Provisional Committee of the *South Australian Land Company*, with the signatures to a Memorial addressed to Viscount Goderich.

parliament; but those who intended to found the colony required no more than a charter from the king; a something to bind the compact into which those individuals were desirous to enter. This piece of parchment was applied for, promised, and ultimately refused; on what grounds applied for, how promised, and how cruelly refused, may be seen by a correspondence between the government and those who intended to found the colony. Part of this correspondence is printed in the Appendix. To those who are curious about the motives, which may induce the government of an old country to *prevent* the foundation of colonies, as well as to those who would ascertain the motives with which, under a good system of colonization, individuals would found colonies, scarcely assisted by their government, the correspondence in question will prove highly instructive.

The old English colonies in America, now the eastern states of the Union, were not founded by any government. They were founded by individuals, not even aided by any government, save as the compact, into which each of those bodies of individuals entered, was bound by a charter from the crown of England. At that time, it had not been discovered that the disposal of waste land in a colony may furnish matter for favour and jobs: at that time, probably, a charter to prevent favour and jobbing in the disposal of waste land

would not have been refused by the government of England. But, at that time, also, none of the great advantages of a fixed and uniform system in the disposal of waste land were understood by any one. The evils of profusion and irregularity have been made apparent by the good resulting from some degree of caution and regularity. What is a new state formed in the western deserts of America, if it be not a new colony? Yet how marked is the contrast between the immediate prosperity of one of those new colonies, and the early misery of one of those which were planted on the eastern coast of America! To whatever extent we may suppose that the prosperity of the newest colonies arises from caution and regularity in the disposal of waste land, so far shall we attribute the early misery of the oldest colonies to profusion and irregularity. If some degree of caution and regularity in the disposal of waste land insure the immediate prosperity of a new colony, it seems clear, that the prosperity of a new colony would be much greater, and much more rapid, under the proposed system of selling all new land and converting all the purchase-money into the most productive labour. An old country, then, by applying this system to desert countries at her disposal, may create stronger motives than ever yet existed for the foundation of colonies by bodies of individuals. This subject well deserves the attention of the English, who have more desert

land at their disposal than any other nation, not excepting the North Americans, and who, more than any other nation, require that their field of production should be enlarged.*

THE GOVERNMENT OF COLONIES.

The advocate of systematic colonization, addressing the corrupt government of an old country, and actuated by that short-sighted policy which attends only to immediate objects, and has no faith in the power of truth, would say: Proceed in such a way that your colonies may be richer than colonies have ever been, more taxable, better worth governing. But the corrupt government of an old country would not be cajoled by this sort of language: it would see, what must be plain to every one, that, if colonies were so many extensions of an old society, they would never submit to be

* Mr. Stuart, one of the soberest and most moderate of writers, supposes that the United States will obtain by the sale of waste land, even under the present defective system, "*some thousand millions of dollars.*" The national debt of England amounts to between *three* and *four* thousand millions of dollars. With Canada, South Africa, Eastern, Western and Southern Australia, New Zealand, (a country admirably fit for colonization) part of the north-west coast of America, Ceylon, (which in many respects is quite fit for colonization) Madagascar perhaps, some desert islands in the Pacific, and great tracts of desert land in India under a fine climate; with all these fields of colonization open to them, the English, surely, might so enlarge their field of production as to laugh at their national debt.

governed from a distance. Truly, if the colonists were kept together by a good system for the disposal of waste land, they would be richer than colonists have ever been, better able to pay taxes, better worth keeping in subjection: but, so likewise, would they be more intelligent, and, as union is force, very much stronger. The scattered, poor and ignorant inhabitants of South Africa could not but submit patiently to the oppression, the sportive injustice and fantastic cruelty, of an English lord sent across the world to do with them as he pleased. They were incapable of governing themselves, and therefore quite unable to resist a foreign tyrant. With the capacity for self-government comes the power to exercise it. A people entirely fit to manage themselves, will never long submit to be managed by others, much less to be managed by an authority residing at a great distance from them. "Government from a distance" says Bentham, "is often mischievous to the people submitted to it. Government is almost always, as respects them, in a state either of jealousy or indifference. They are either neglected or pillaged; they are made places of banishment for the vilest part of society, or places to be pillaged by minions and favourites, whom it is desirable suddenly to enrich. The sovereign at two thousand leagues' distance from his subjects, can be acquainted neither with their wants, their interests, their manners, nor their character. The most

legitimate and weighty complaints weakened by reason of distance, stripped of every thing that might excite sensibility, of every thing which might soften or subdue the pride of power, are delivered, without defence, into the cabinet of the prince, to the most insidious interpretations, to the most unfaithful representations. The colonists are still too happy if their demand of justice is not construed into a crime, and if their most moderate remonstrances are not punished as acts of rebellion. In a word, little is cared for their affection, nothing is feared from their resentment, and their despair is contemned."* But why is their anger despised? Because it is not dangerous; because they are helpless; because they are, what is called, new societies. Let colonies be old societies in new places, and they will have the power to chuse between self-government and government from a distance. That they would chuse to govern themselves cannot be doubted by any one, who is at all acquainted with the evils of being governed from a distance.

Bentham well describes how difficult it is for subject colonies to obtain any redress of grievances; but he says little of the grievances of which such colonies must necessarily have to complain. If one were ill, it would be a hard case when the physician resided thousands of miles off, and months must elapse before one could hear from

* *Rationale of Reward*, B. 4, chap. 14.

him by return of post; but the degree of hardship would greatly depend on the nature of the disease. It is not very easy for people, who have never been governed from a distance, to understand the nature of the evils which are thus inflicted on dependent colonies. Every government must be supported by some kind of force. The distant government seldom maintains in the colony an armed force sufficient to preserve its authority. Some other means, then, must be adopted to make the colonists obey laws which are enacted by persons at a distance, knowing little of the colony and caring less for it; laws too, administered by strangers, not fixed in the colony, nor in any degree responsible to the subject people. The way in which this object is commonly attained, is by dividing the colonists; by getting up hostile factions amongst them; by allowing some of them to share with the strangers in all kinds of jobs and monopolies. In order that the strangers may pillage the colony, some of the colonists are allowed to pillage it. In all the more extensive colonies which are governed from Downing Street, London, there is a strong party of colonists attached to the government, and amongst the worst enemies of the colonial people. The machinery whereby misgovernment thus supports itself, is generally, a council in the colony, composed partly of strangers, partly of colonists, all named by the governor; by which

mockery of a legislative assembly, the people of the mother-country, when by chance they think of the colonies, are led to suppose that the colonies are pretty well governed; while, in truth the governor's council is a most efficient means of misgovernment, since it enables his excellency to perform, or to authorize, acts of oppression, which he would never have dared to do, or authorize, on his own single responsibility. If a governor of New South Wales should ever be called to account for acts of cruel oppression in that colony, those acts would be defended on the ground that they were approved by the council, an assembly consisting partly of settlers, having an interest in common with the whole body of colonists. That would be the defence; whereas the truth is, that the colonial members of the governor's council in New South Wales have been deeply interested in that misgovernment of which they shared the profits, in the shape of contracts, undue supplies of convict labour and immense grants of land. In Upper Canada, says Mr. Ellice,* "it was the fashion for every *councillor* to get a grant of from 5,000 to 20,000 acres, to the great detriment of the country and the great nuisance of the inhabitants around." This is only a sample of the numerous ways, in which some of the inhabitants of subject colonies are bribed to lend their assistance in hurting the other inhabitants; to lend

* Now English minister at war.

their names to the strangers, so that the acts of those strangers may be glossed over with the semblance of being approved by the colonists; to lend their voices, and in case of need, their arms, to the strangers, so that to the force of the strangers there may be added that of a strong colonial faction. Hence more pillage than would have satisfied the strangers; hence the most bitter feuds amongst the colonists themselves; hence, more or less, the peculiar evils, which Ireland has suffered by being governed from a distance through the instrumentality of a strong domestic faction. The evil of having to obey laws made at a distance would be great, but less than the evils inflicted in order to procure obedience to laws so made. The government of colonies from a distance involves both kinds of evil.

So much evil would never long be borne by a colony which had been founded, or which was extended, in the way here proposed. The colony being fit, would be able to govern itself. It must be confessed, therefore, that the ruling class of an old country, looking only to immediate and selfish ends, has an interest in preventing systematic colonization: a double interest; first, as for every colony fit to govern itself there would be less room for colonies liable to be governed from a distance; secondly, as the example of systematic colonization and colonial self-government in one place, might lead to the systematic extension, and then

to the self-government, of colonies, which were founded, and have hitherto been extended, without any regard to the ends and means of colonization. Here, perhaps, we may discover why, last year, the English government prevented the foundation of a colony which, in local matters, was to have governed itself as soon as the population should amount to 50,000 souls.

In this respect, the English have reason to be proud of the wisdom of their ancestors. All the early colonies of the English were allowed to govern themselves from the beginning; with this single exception, that the mother-country reserved to herself a monopoly of the foreign trade of the colony. In every case, the colonial laws were made by an assembly of colonists, elected by the colonists; and in some cases those laws were executed by officers, including the governor, who were appointed by the colonists. The charters, in a word, under which bodies of Englishmen planted colonies in America, laid the foundation of democracy in that part of the world. At that time, the English ruling class had not discovered how to profit by the exercise of dominion over distant colonies. No sooner, however, did the English take possession of colonies, which had been founded by other nations without any provision for local self-government, than the aristocracy of England found out the advantage of holding colonies in subjection. This ad-

vantage became still more clear when the English government had made a settlement in New Holland; had established a jail there; a society, which, of course, could not be allowed to govern itself.

As to that colony, the system of transportation is a good excuse for withholding from the free settlers the advantage of self-government, and will be maintained on that account, as well as on account of its great expense, until the new ruling class of England shall please to exert their authority. Well-informed as the English aristocracy now are of the many advantages to themselves attendant on holding colonies in subjection, they will always be ready with excuses for not reverting to the system of colonial self-government. They seek to deny, that the system of governing colonies from Downing Street is a modern innovation.*

Those English colonies which govern themselves in local matters, are distinguished by the name of *chartered colonies*, while the others are called *crown colonies*. The crown colonies, such as New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land, and South Africa, being governed in local matters from Downing Street, London, and affording a vast deal of patronage to the noblemen and gentlemen who live in that street, are most sincerely preferred by the English government. But, not-

* See Correspondence in Appendix, No. 8.

withstanding this partial affection for crown colonies, it is a fact, I believe, that never, till last year, did the English government refuse to bestow a charter of incorporation and local self-government upon individuals ready to found a colony at their own expense: it is a fact, also, that the only colony, founded by Englishmen without such a charter, is the miserable Swan River settlement, the last colony founded by Englishmen.

The chartered colonies of England, governing themselves from the beginning in local matters, have usually defrayed the whole cost of their local government: the cost, on the contrary, of governing the crown colonies has generally fallen upon England. Here are two reasons against crown colonies: first, the expense which they occasion to the country whose rulers hold them in subjection; secondly, the absence of any motive in the government of the colony for letting the colonists be rich enough to bear taxation.

The difference between the cost of governing crown and chartered colonies is very much in favour of the latter. "All the different civil establishments in North America," says Adam Smith, "exclusive of Maryland and North Carolina, of which no exact account has been got, did not, before the commencement of the present disturbances, cost the inhabitants above 64,000*l.* a year; an ever memorable example at how small an expense three millions of people may not only

be governed, but well governed." The yearly cost of governing fifty thousand people in New South Wales was lately about 234,000*l.*, the salaries of officers alone, being 53,468*l.*; an ever memorable example at how great an expense a colony may be, not only governed, but very ill governed.* The crown colony of the Swan River, with about fifteen hundred inhabitants, already costs England near 7000*l.* a year: the local government of the chartered colony, which it was proposed to found at Spencer's Gulph, was to have cost, not England, but the inhabitants, 5000*l.* a year, and no more, until the population should reach 50,000 souls. Chartered colonies, those which conduct and pay for their own local government, are sure to be very moderate in their public expenses; while the expense of governing colonies from a distance is sure to be as great as the people of the ruling

* Specimen of the Salaries in New South Wales.

Governor - - - - -	£4,200
Colonial Treasurer - - -	1,000
Colonial Secretary and Registrar -	2,000
His compensation for loss of Pension	750
Naval Officer - - - -	2,585
Chief Justice - - - -	2,000
Assistant Judge - - - -	1,500
Ditto - - - - - -	1,500
Attorney-General - - -	1,400
Sheriff and Provost Marshal - -	1,000
Archdeacon - - - - -	2,000
Surveyor-General - - -	1,000

country, who find the money, will allow. The cheapness of local self-government is sure to present a striking contrast with the dearness of government from a distance; a contrast painful to those who profit by governing colonies from a distance.

Of two other reasons in favour of local self-government, one is obvious; the other requires some explanation. First, a body of colonists who should manage their own affairs, in their own way for their own advantage, would be sure to manage better than any foreign government, whether on the spot or at a distance: the local government, unless very ill constituted, would have the deepest interest in the prosperity of the colony. But, secondly, the form and substance of the local government would very much depend upon the character of the first settlers. *Magna virûm mater!* exclaims Adam Smith, when he gives to England the credit of having furnished the men fit to establish empires in America. But would those superior men have quitted England for that purpose, without a prospect of self-government? would such a man as William Penn have crossed the Atlantic, knowing that, when in America, he should be subject to a minister like Horace Twiss,* residing in England? The

* This gentleman, Americans ought to be told, is an English barrister, practising in the courts of chancery and bankruptcy. The Duke of Wellington made him under secretary of state for

greater number, it is true, of the founders of the United States fled from persecution; but some of them did not; and all of them may be supposed to have been moved, in part, by a sentiment of ambition. The founders of a colony, which is to be governed by the colonists, are sure to enjoy a greater degree of consideration and importance amongst their companions, than they could reasonably have hoped to attain in the old society. By the mere act of removing, they become legislators and statesmen; the legislators and statesmen of a new country too, created, as it were, by themselves. In the charters, under which the old English colonies in America were planted, we find recited the names of the men who projected and accomplished those great undertakings. It was thus, that men of a superior order were induced to run the risk of failure in those enterprizes; men who, by their energy, judgment, patience and resolution, were especially qualified to make those enterprizes succeed. As a colony fit to manage its own affairs would not submit to have them managed from a distance, so a colony allowed to manage its own affairs, would attract men fit to manage them. In the Swan River colony, which was founded by a minister, scarce any provision has been made for

the colonies: he was concerned in the foundation of the Swan River settlement; and spoke, first, against the reform bill in the House of Commons.

good government: in the plan of an intended colony at Spencer's Gulph, a plan formed by individuals, provision was carefully made for legislation, for the administration of justice, for the support of religion,* for the education of all classes, and for the defence of the colony. This difference is explained by the difference between a crown colony and a chartered one. In the latter case, the charter of incorporation and self-government attracted to the undertaking men of a superior order; men knowing what they were about, having definite objects and a clear con-

* The provision for the support of religion, suggested by persons of a very religious turn of mind, who intended to settle in the colony, was an article in the proposed charter, which declared that in this colony there should be no political church. This provision led a number of Dissenters to join the body of intended colonists. The dissenters began to raise a subscription amongst themselves and their friends for building a church, in which their mode of worship was to be followed; when the members of the church of England, who intended to emigrate, immediately began to raise a subscription for establishing their mode of worship in the colony. The present bishop of London, be it said to his honour, having been consulted about the church-of-England subscription, found no fault with the provision against a political church, but engaged to assist the intended settlers of his persuasion in raising money for a church of their own. Of course, however, both these incipient subscriptions fell to the ground, when Lord Goderich refused to grant the charter which his lordship had promised a year before. See Correspondence in Appendix, No. 3.

ception of the means for accomplishing them. Would such men have gone to a crown colony? The answer is, that they would *not;* for, when Lord Goderich wanted these men to go to the Swan River, they answered, that nothing would induce them to settle "in a colony, where there is no security for the inestimable advantage of local self-government."

But, though it should be allowed, that new colonies founded by charter of incorporation and local self-government would put the mother-country to no expense for their internal government, still an objection to new colonies, which rests on the necessity of protecting them from foreign violence, remains untouched. That necessity would certainly exist in every case where the colony was unable to defend itself. But colonies, which governed themselves, have commonly been able to defend themselves. The colonies of Greece were able, not only to defend themselves, but to assist their parent states in resisting foreign violence. The chartered colonies of North America were able to defend themselves against their mother-country, when she had the folly to attack their local independence. Dependence teaches colonies to lean upon their mother-country: independence from the beginning teaches them to provide for self-defence; not to mention that a colony, which manages its own affairs, has more, infinitely more, to defend than a colony whose

affairs are shamefully managed from a distance. Thus, while at the Swan River no provision whatever has been made for self defence, it was proposed by those who intended to found a colony at Spencer's Gulph, that the whole body of settlers should be formed into a militia; and as the sum of 125,000*l.* offered to the government for the first grant of land would have conveyed to the settlement about 4,000 young couples, this colony would have had from the beginning an armed force of 4,000 men; a greater force, perhaps, than was ever maintained by any mother-country in any new colony. In that case, too, not only would colonization have proceeded with unexampled rapidity, but the colonists, instead of being enfeebled by dispersion, would always have been strong in proportion to their numbers. Accustomed to the use of arms, chusing their own leaders, defending the work of their own hands, which is the foreign government that would have thought it worth while to attack them? A subject colony may not be harmed, may be benefited, by a change of masters. Subject colonies, accordingly have, over and over again, submitted to foreigners; but when did a colony, that flourished at all, and was independent from the beginning, yield up the main cause of its prosperity, its precious independence? Judging from past facts, we may conclude, that if the art of colonization were skilfully pursued, if colonies were

independent, and were founded or extended so as to be, not new societies, but old societies in new places, the defence of them from foreign violence would not require any outlay by the mother-country. Nay more, says Adam Smith, "they might be disposed to favour their mother-country in *war* as well as in trade; and, instead of turbulent and factious subjects, to become her most faithful, affectionate and generous allies; with the same parental affection on the one side, and the same filial respect on the other, which used to subsist between the colonies of ancient Greece and the mother-city from which they descended."

Passing by the exploded notion, that an old country is interested in preserving a monopoly of the trade with her colonies, we have still to enquire, whether it be advantageous to colonies to enjoy privileges in the market of their mother-country.

Supposing that the monopoly of the English sugar-market enjoyed by the planters of the West Indies takes out of the pockets of the English, and puts into the pockets of the planters, 2,000,000*l.* a year, this would seem to be a case in which colonists gain by the sort of monopoly in question. In like manner, the Canadians appear to gain what the English lose, by the Canadian monopoly of the English timber trade. Nay, in the former case, the very existence of the colonists seems to depend on their monopoly of the

English sugar-market; for every one allows that, if the English were permitted to buy sugar in the cheapest market they could any where find, there would soon be an end to the growth of sugar in the West Indies. But has not this monopoly, on which the existence of the colonists now depends, been the cause of that unnatural state of things, under which the monopoly is of such vast importance to the colonists? If the West Indians had never possessed any privilege in the market of England, it seems probable that, warned by the decrease of their profits, arising from the exhaustion of their land, they would have diverted their capital from the growth of sugar to some other employment: they might even, from the moment when sugar grown on virgin soils came into competition with their sugar, have seen that it was for their advantage to set free their slaves, so as to convert these human cattle into competitors for the use of land. One must say, perhaps; because it is doubtful whether slaves, very numerous in proportion to their masters of a different colour, can ever be set free without a period of anarchy. But, however this may be, what have the West Indies become with the monopoly? They have become, with, and by means of, the monopoly, societies so monstrously unnatural as to depend for their very existence on the patience of a distant people, who do not love them, in submitting to pay 2,000,000*l.* to keep their heads

above water. In like manner, though we should acknowledge that the Canadians gain what the English lose by the difference between the price or quality of Canadian timber and Baltic timber in the English market, still the Canadian monopoly produces in Canada an unnatural state of things; artificially turning to the lumber trade more capital than would naturally be employed in it, and exposing the Canadians to be ruined by so proper an act on the part of the English government as that of letting the English people buy timber of whom they please. If colonies gain for a time by monopolizing some trade in the market of their mother-country, their condition is unnatural and dangerous in proportion to their gains. Such a monopoly, if its continuance depended altogether on the colonists themselves, might perhaps be defended, as the American tariff may be defended, on the score of its tendency to promote combination of labour and division of employments amongst the colonists; but the continuance of such a monopoly must always depend upon the good pleasure of the mother-country. For every colony, therefore, such monopolies are bad; and bad just in proportion as they seem good. For colonies, founded or extended so that the colonists should combine labour and divide employments, not only amongst themselves, but with the people of their mother-country; for colonies that should naturally raise exchangeable commodities, such monopolies or privileges would not even appear to be good. In the intended colony at Spencer's Gulph, accordingly, it was proposed that trade, both of import and of export, should be entirely free. Port Lincoln was to have been a port without a custom-house. Is this why Lord Goderich, the eloquent advocate of free-trade, willed that it should remain without ships?

For it must be confessed, that colonial monopolies of trade in the mother-country are of very great use, indeed, for holding dependent colonies in subjection. A dependent colony, brought into an unnatural and dangerous state by such a monopoly, dares not to offend the rulers of its mother-country. The colonists of South Africa with their wine monopoly, of Canada with their timber monopoly, and of the West Indies with their sugar monopoly, are far more subservient to Downing Street, than they would be if the people of England were free to buy wine, timber and sugar, in the cheapest markets they could any where find. In this way, the people of England pay magnificently to enable their rulers to profit in another way by the dependence of colonies. It would be much cheaper for the people of England, and quite as profitable to the English aristocracy, if, the colonies being left to themselves, a sum equal to the actual cost of holding and misgoverning them, were placed at the disposal

of the English cabinet, under the honest name of *a fund for Corruption.* Thus would all the cost of the monopolies be entirely saved, without any decrease of ministerial patronage. But then, it may be said, the corruption would be too plain to be borne. Doubtless; and here is seen one "public inconvenience"* that might have arisen from the establishment of a colonial port without a custom-house; the inconvenience of an example, which, if generally followed, would have taken from the English aristocracy one of their chief instruments for holding, harassing and depressing colonial possessions.

* See Correspondence in the Appendix, No. 3.

THE END.

APPENDIX.

No. 1.

PROOFS OF THE INDUSTRY, SKILL AND COMMERCIAL DISPOSITION, OF THE CHINESE PEOPLE.

No. 2.

PROOFS OF THE RAPIDITY WITH WHICH WASTE LAND RISES IN VALUE, WHEREVER PEOPLE CONGREGATE, IN NEW COLONIES.

No. 3.

PART OF A CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT AND A BODY OF INDIVIDUALS WISHING TO FOUND A COLONY.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

Proofs of the industry, skill and commercial disposition of the Chinese people.

Sir George Staunton, in his account of Lord Macartney's embassy thus describes the Chinese emigrants at Batavia.

"Great numbers of Chinese come constantly to Batavia with exactly the same views that attract the natives of Holland to it—the desire of accumulating wealth in a foreign land. Both generally belonged to the humbler classes of life, and were bred in similar habits of industry in their own country; but the different circumstances that attend them after their arrival in Batavia, put an end to any further resemblance between them. The Chinese have, there, no way of getting forward but by a continuance of their former exertions in a place where they are more liberally rewarded, and by a strict economy in the preservation of their gains. They have no chance of advancing by favour; nor are public offices open to their ambition: but they apply to every industrious occupation, and obtain whatever care and labour can accomplish. They become, in town, retailers, clerks, and agents: in the country they are farmers, and the principal cultivators of the sugar-cane. They do, at length, acquire fortunes, which they value by the time and labour required to earn them. So gradual an acquisition makes no change in

their disposition or mode of life. Their industry is not diminished, nor their health impaired.

* * * * * * * *

"The Chinese are said to be now as numerous as ever again in and about Batavia; for however imminent the danger to which the Dutch alledge that they are exposed by the intended former insurrection of this people, and however cruel and unjustifiable the Chinese consider the conduct of the Dutch towards them at that time, the occasion they have for each other has brought them again together; and it is acknowledged by the latter that the settlement could scarcely exist without the industry and ingenuity of the former."

In Mr. BARROW's voyage to Cochin China, the following passages occur:—

"The next description of inhabitants of Batavia, who in number and opulence exceeds the former, is the Chinese. These people, as appears by their records, first obtained a settlement in Java about the year 1412. As intruders, but not conquerors, it is probable that they have at all times been subject to harsh and oppressive treatment; but the restrictions and extortions under which they at present (1793) labour, seem as unnecessary and impolitic as they are unjust. That they should consent to the Mahomedans, Malays, and Javanese exercising their devotions in the same temple, which they built at their own expense, and consecrated to the god of their own worship, is by no means an unfavourable feature in their character; but on the part of the Dutch who enforce the measure, it is one of the greatest insults that could well be offered. The Chinese hospital or infirmary, which was erected by voluntary contributions from their own community, and is supported by legacies arising from theatrical exhibitions and fire-works, and by a small tax on marriages, funerals, and the celebration of public

festivals, is equally open for the benefit and reception of those who have not contributed towards the establishment, and who do not belong to the society. Into this admirable institution are indiscriminately admitted the infirm and the aged, the friendless and the indigent, of all nations. Towards the support of those institutions, the temple and the infirmary, their contributions are voluntary; but exclusive of these, their industry is severely taxed by the Dutch government. Every religious festival and public ceremony, every popular amusement, as well as every branch of individual industry, are subject to taxation. They are even obliged to pay for a license to wear their hair in a long plaited tail, according to the custom of their country; for permission to bring their greens to market, and to sell their produce and manufactures in the streets. *Yet to the industry and exertions of those people are the Dutch wholly indebted for the means of existing with any tolerable degree of comfort in Batavia.* Every species of vegetable for the table is raised by them in all seasons of the year, and *at times when the most indefatigable attention and labour are required.* They are masons, carpenters, blacksmiths, painters, upholsterers, tailors, and shoe-makers. They are employed in the arts of *distilling, sugar-refining, pottery, lime-burning, and every other trade and profession that are indispensably necessary for making the state of civilized society tolerably comfortable.* They are, moreover, the contractors for supplying the various demands of the civil, military, and marine establishments in the settlement; they are the collectors of the rates, the customs, and the taxes; and, in short, are *the monopolizers of the interior commerce of the island; and with the Malays, carry on the principal part of the coasting trade.*

"The influence which would naturally follow from the

management of concerns so important and so extensive, could not long be regarded by a weak and luxurious government without jealousy. Those arts which the Europeans have usually followed with success in establishing themselves in foreign countries, and which the Dutch have not been backward in carefully studying and effectually carrying into practice, with regard to the natives of Java, could not be applied with the least hope of success to the Chinese settlers. These people had no sovereign to dethrone, by opposing to him the claims of a usurper; nor did the separate interests of any petty chief allow them, by exciting jealousy, to put in execution the old adage of *divide et impera*, divide and command. With as little hope of success could the masters of the island venture to seduce an industrious and abstemious people from their temperate habits by the temptation of foreign luxuries; and their general disposition to sobriety held out no encouragement for the importation of spirituous liquors and intoxicating drugs. For, though the Chinese who are in circumstances to afford it, make use of opium to excess, yet this is a luxury in which the common people of this nation rarely think of indulging. The Dutch, therefore, who are weak in point of numbers, had recourse to a more decisive and speedy measure for getting rid of a redundancy of population, which had begun to create suspicion and alarm: they put them to the sword.

* * * * * * * *

"This extraordinary affair took place on the 9th of October; the whole of the 10th was a day of plunder; and on the 11th they began to remove out of the streets the dead bodies, the interment of which occupied them eight days. The number said to have perished, according to the Dutch account, amounts to more than twelve thousand souls. Having thus completed one of the most inhuman, and apparently causeless transactions that ever

disgraced a civilized people, they had the audacity to proclaim a public thanksgiving to the God of Mercy for their happy deliverance from the hands of the heathen. While the Dutch, in their public records, endeavour to justify this atrocious act on the plea of necessity, they make the following memorable observation:—'It is remarkable that this people, notwithstanding their great numbers, offered not the least resistance, but suffered themselves to be led like sheep to the slaughter!' For my own part, when I reflect on the timid character of the Chinese, their want of confidence in each other, and their strong aversion to the shedding of human blood: and when I compare their situation in Batavia to that of the Hottentot in the colony of the Cape of Good Hope, where every little irregularity is magnified into a plot against the government, I cannot forbear giving a decided opinion that these people were innocently murdered. The consequences to the Dutch proved much more serious than at first they seemed to have been aware of. The terrified Chinese, who escaped the massacre, fled into the interior of the island; a scarcity of rice and every kind of vegetables, succeeded; and the apprehensions of a famine induced them to offer terms to the fugitives and to entreat their return."

Sir Stamford Raffles, in his history of Java, writes as follows:

"Besides the natives, whose number, circumstances, and character I have slightly mentioned, there is in Java a rapidly increasing race of foreigners, who have emigrated from the different surrounding countries. The most numerous and important class of these is the Chinese, who already (1815) do not fall short of a hundred thousand; and who, with a system of free trade, and free cultivation, would soon accumulate ten-fold, by

natural increase within the island and gradual accessions of new settlers from home. They reside principally in the great capitals of Batavia, Semárang, and Surabáya, but they are to be found in all the smaller capitals, and scattered over most parts of the country. A great proportion of them are descended from families, who have been many generations on the island;—additions are gradually making to their numbers. They arrive at Batavia from China to the amount of a thousand or more annually, in Chinese junks, carrying three, four, and five hundred each, without money or resources; but by dint of their industry soon acquire comparative opulence. There are no women in Java, who come directly from China, but as the Chinese often marry the daughters of their countrymen by Javan women, there results a numerous mixed race which is often scarcely distinguishable from the native Chinese."

Mr. FINLAYSON, in his account of the Mission to Siam and Hué, in 1822, speaks as follows of the Chinese emigrants at Penang and Sincapore.

"We had not proceeded far (at Penang) before a more interesting and more gratifying scene was expanded to our observation. Industry, active, useful, manly and independent, seemed here to have found a congenial soil and fostering care. The indolent air of the Asiatic was thrown aside. Every one laboured to produce some useful object, and every countenance teeming with animation, seemed, as it were, directed to a set task. With the air, they had lost even the slender frame of the Asiatic; and the limbs, and muscularity, and symmetry were those of another and more energetic race. These were Chinese, a people highly valuable as settlers, by reason of their industrious and regular habits, who had established on this spot the mechanical arts, on a scale which might

even vie with that of the European artists, but which we look for in vain in any other part of India. It was a pleasing and gratifying spectacle—so much are we in India accustomed to the opposite—to see a numerous, very muscular, and apparently hardy race of people, labouring with a degree of energy and acuteness, which gave to their physical character a peculiar stamp, and placed them in a highly favourable point of view, when compared with the habits of the nation around them. Their manner of using their instruments, so different from the puerile style of Indian artists, had in it much of the dexterity of the Europeans: while their condition bespoke them a flourishing and wealthy tribe. All the principal shops, all important and useful employments, and *almost all the commerce of the island*, was in their hands. Under the patronage of the British government they soon acquire riches; they meet with entire protection of property and person, and are cherished by the government, which, in return, derives benefits from their industry, and from the commercial and profitable speculations in which they usually engage.

* * * * * * * *

"The neatness, the industry, and the ingenuity displayed in plantations of this sort (at Sincapore) afford a very gratifying spectacle, and attest the great progress which the Chinese nation has made in agricultural science. The Chinese may be considered as the sole cultivators of the soil.

* * * * * * * *

"The most prominent feature in the character of the Chinese emigrant, is industry: the best and highest endowment which he has attained. He is mechanically uniform and steady in the pursuit of what he conceives to be his immediate and personal interest, in the prosecution of which he exerts a degree of ingenuity and of bodily labour and exertion, which leave all the Asiatics

at a distance. He labours with a strong arm, and is capable of great and continued exertion. He is not satisfied to bestow the quantity of labour necessary for the mere gratification of his immediate wants. Profusion and indulgence claim a share of the produce of his toils. Next in the catalogue of his virtues may be reckoned general sobriety, honesty, a quiet, orderly conduct, obedience to the laws of the country in which he resides; and, as is affirmed, a strong and unalterable sense of the important duties which parental affection inculcates.

* * * * * * * *

"It must be confessed, however, that the Chinese are in a political point of view, at least, by far the most useful class of people to be found in the Indian seas or Archipelago. *Their robust frames, their industrious habits, and their moderate conduct place them beyond competition. They furnish the best artizans, the most useful labourers, and the most extensive traders. Their commercial speculations are often extensive, and often of the most adventurous nature.*"

Mr. DOBELL, who resided in China for several years, and whose lately published account of that country abounds with valuable information, says—

"The reader must excuse this digression on the subject of the Chinese foreign commerce, as many have asserted China to be a country wholly agricultural and manufacturing, while real experience proves the contrary. After giving this imperfect account of it, which might have been extended to a volume, and given more in detail, no one will, I think, believe that the Chinese are locked up at home. It may, indeed, be safely asserted, that they are one of the most commercial nations of the globe.*

The above descriptions of the Chinese people are

* Residence in China, vol. 2, page 159.

confirmed by several witnesses before the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company; from whose evidence the following statements are extracted.

Captain CHARLES HUTCHINSON, a commander in the navy, who commanded the Bombay Castle, from Liverpool, and went to India; and remained there five years.

"As you were three times at Canton engaged in those transactions of commerce, what should you say, from your opportunities of observing the character and habits of the people of China, as to their disposition with respect to intercourse with other countries and carrying on trade generally?—*They have a very great avidity to trade with every body they are permitted to trade with. The merchants of China are extremely eager to trade with every one that comes into the country; more so than any people I have seen.*

"Do you mean to say that they are a *speculative, trading, enterprising country?—Very much so; beyond any other I have seen.*

"Should you think it is a just distinction, speaking of the Chinese nation, to say that the people are speculative, and much disposed to foreign trade, although the government is professedly adverse to communication with foreigners?—Yes, certainly; the government may be said to be so far adverse to trade, that it is jealous of you, knowing what you have done in India, and it is apprehensive of your intrusion; but so long as they may be secure that nothing else would be attempted, they are as desirous of carrying on the trade as the people themselves.

"Did you happen to hear whether the British manufactures found their way into the interior of China, or whether they were confined to the districts adjacent to Canton?—They find their way into the interior, so far as the carriage of them will allow without rendering

them too dear. They are very desirous of obtaining them, I understand, in all parts of China, *particularly in many northern districts, where they require the woollens for warm clothing.*

" Do you think that if there were an open trade the Chinese would consume British cotton manufactures to any great extent?—The Chinese admitting them only at one port, of course the consumption could not be extended so far as if they were admitted at other ports, but as far as they could be carried with advantage, the Chinese would be glad to buy them and use them."

Mr. Charles Everett, a commission merchant, who was engaged for eleven years, since the year 1818, in purchasing goods for the China market, on account of American merchants.

" Have you any doubt, from the experience you have had, that if the existing restrictions were removed, the trade to China in British manufactures might be materially increased?—I have no doubt the trade might be increased to a considerable extent by proper management, if the restrictions were removed."

Joshua Bates, Esq., an American; agent for an American house connected with the East India trade; then partner of the firm of J. Bates and John Baring, and lastly, partner of the house of Baring, Brothers and Co.; both of which houses had the management of the business of an American house particularly connected with the China trade.

" You have expressed an opinion, that in the event of the China trade being thrown open, it would probably centre in this country; would that arise from cheaper purchases of tea, or from cheaper supplies in this country, or from cheaper shipping being engaged, or from

what other cause?—There would be a great export of manufactures to those regions, and of course something would be wanted for returns. They would bring back teas, and every description of produce they could find in those countries; and not only would they bring back such, but perhaps increase them by the very act of carrying manufactures, as many of the inhabitants of those countries, who have hitherto not laboured at all, seeing such beautiful things brought out from this country, would be desirous of possessing them, and proceed to labour to get something to buy them with; and this course of trade would bring, perhaps, more tea here than is wanted; and the price being reduced, it would either be bought for smuggling into the continent, or for exporting to those places to which it would go legally.

" Do you consider the trade in China susceptible of any great increased stimulus?—I see nothing to prevent it increasing very much."

Mr. John Deans, a resident in the Eastern Archipelago for twenty years.

" What is their (the Chinese people) character as traders, speaking generally?—*They are keen, enterprising traders, extremely expert in their dealings, and understand the nature of the trade of those countries in which they are settled, perhaps better than any other people.*

" Have they information that enables them to carry on their commercial transactions with advantage?—*They seem to have very accurate information, and receive it very quickly too.*

" What is their character as merchants, with reference to the punctuality of their dealings and the mode of transacting business?—Those who have obtained *a high reputation are extremely tenacious of it, and they are very punctual in all their dealings.*

"Do they appear to possess more or less of the characteristics which are requisite for the business of a merchant than the natives of other oriental countries?—*I do not think they are exceeded by the natives of any country as a commercial people.*

"*Do you include European countries?—I do.*

"Is it difficult to transact business with them?—Not the least; I have never had any difficulty with the Chinese.

"Have you, in point of fact, transacted much business with them?—I have, very extensive business.

"Will you state what that business was?—I imported largely British manufactures to Java, and the medium of communication with the natives was generally through the Chinese, who purchased from me in whole cases or bales, and retailed to natives, giving me their simple notes of hand for payment, and being always punctual in meeting those demands.

"Have you any reason to form an opinion whether the taste for European manufactures which exists amongst the Chinese inhabitants of Java, is peculiar to them, or whether it extends also to the inhabitants of the empire itself?—I cannot exactly state this; the settlers are Chinese; their habits are the same in the Archipelago as in their native country, I believe, *and they readily adopt our manufactures in preference to their own, when those are cheaper and better.* When I first went to Java, in 1811, they were almost exclusively clothed in Chinese manufactures, and *I witnessed a revolution, which almost clothed them in European manufactures, during the time I was there.*

"Have you reason to know in what light the European imports into China are considered by the Chinese people, or whether they could easily be dispensed with by them?—I know that the imports to China are of far more importance to that empire than perhaps the tea is to this country, great as it is considered.

"Can you state to the committee any instance of the discovery of a new article, or the extension of the production of an old one, which has added to the value of the imports into China?—I can state one, perhaps not of great importance, but it would shew that there are many others with respect to which the same thing might be done. The large glasses or rummers which are used in their houses for burning a light before their gods, opposite their front door; I noticed them on one occasion as being made of imperfect China-glass. I asked the Chinese if they would have any objection to British manufacture, if the same patterns were preserved, and they gave me patterns of them, which I brought home, and had manufactured at Birmingham. *I took them out, and had them sold for a considerable price, and they have since continued to be supplied from different places to a great extent.*

Mr. John Argyle Maxwell.

"Supposing the trade in tea to be thrown open, do you conceive that tea might be imported into Sincapore of a quality fit for the European market, and in sufficient quantity?—I have no ground for speaking positively on that subject: but several of the Chinese there have frequently offered to contract with me for the supply of black teas from Fokien.

Robert Rickards, Esq.

"Have you have had any communication or information enabling you to form an opinion of the anxiety of the Chinese to extend their trade?—I believe that the Chinese are a perfectly commercial people. Wherever the Chinese have been established in Sincapore, in Java, in

Borneo, and in the other eastern Islands where they are settled in great numbers, they are found to be the principal traders, and the most industrious people in the country. I therefore take the Chinese, generally speaking, to be a perfectly commercial people, and exceedingly anxious to extend their commercial dealings, in spite of any restrictive regulations that may be imposed upon them by the Chinese government.

"Have you had any specific examples brought to your notice of the desire on the part of the Chinese, in other ports than Canton, to open a communication with English merchants?—Yes. I have in my possession an extract of a letter from an European merchant who had visited China, to his friend and correspondent in Calcutta. It is dated Canton, 19th September, 1823; and the extract is as follows:

"'The Manilla people only are allowed liberty to trade with Amoy, which would have been granted to us could we have waited. A mandarin followed us *seven miles from the port of Amoy, to entreat our return,* which however our plans would not admit of. We experienced civil treatment, even from the mandarins of rank, and the complaisance of the inhabitants generally formed an agreeable contrast to the haughty demeanour of the lowest here (Canton.) The single circumstance of foreigners not being denied women (as they are most rigidly here, Canton) speaks volumes. No foreigner is allowed to remain after the departure of his ship. As far as we could learn, no charge similar to measurement-duty is levied on foreign ships. The government revenue is derived from an export-duty, which the foreigner pays on his export cargo; but this duty appears to be not fixed: and I suspect the injudiciousness of the mandarins in increasing it beyond bounds, is the cause of the discontinuance of the trade by the Manilla people. It is

probable that, with a view to bring it back, the mandarins would now be more reasonable. They seem to say, that the Hong Merchants of Amoy are pretty much in the bankrupt situation of those here (Canton.) They inquired much the most for the articles from the eastern isles imported in their junks; and also for rice, *for which they rely mainly on Formosa;* but we could form no idea of the price to be obtained for them. The prices of the European articles we saw in the shops were not so much above the Canton rates as was to be expected. I am very keen for an adventure to Amoy, for the purpose of opening new channels for opium in that quarter, the chief mart of its consumption; but it is too weighty a concern for us to undertake singly; and I have contented myself with writing to Manilla for information, and with sounding our friends there on the subject. As you have already adventured in a Chinese bottom, you will, I hope, give a lift to our plans also. The foreign trade in junks is not contraband in China, since the accession of the present family (about 1660). It is *connived at by the government, and is, I believe, even licensed at Amoy.* I do not see why a junk could not load goods at Amoy or elsewhere, as if for a foreign port, (Manilla, Batavia, &c.) and afterwards trans-ship them to a foreign vessel waiting in the neighbourhood.'"

JOHN CRAWFURD, Esq.

"From your intercourse with those Chinese, do you conceive them to be an intelligent, active and commercial people?—Eminently so. They are a very industrious people in every way; they are a business-like people; their manners more resemble Europeans in that part of their character than they do those of Asiatic nations.

"In industry and intelligence do you conceive them to be superior to other Asiatic nations?—For all useful and

practical purposes I think they are. There are perhaps a few points in which they are inferior to one or two other Asiatic nations, but those points are of very little moment."

JOHN STEWART, Esq. a Member of the Committee.

"Will you state what opinion you have formed of them as a commercial people, or an anti-commercial people?—From the intercourse I have had with the Chinese at Canton, I certainly consider them a people of very great commercial enterprise, although I believe the policy of the Chinese is against extending the foreign commerce of the country."

Captain JOHN MACKIE.

"Are you of opinion that the Chinese in the places you visited are anxious for the extension of commerce?—I should conceive that they were, because *I have always found the Chinese inclined to buy any thing that was at all useful, of any description.*

"You conceive them to be any thing but an anti-commercial people?—I should consider them to be quite otherwise.

JOHN FRANCIS DAVIES, Esq.

"The Chinese, if left by their rulers to themselves, would perhaps be the most industrious people in the world."

MR. CRAWFURD'S STATEMENT.

(Extracted from the Third Report of the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company.)

"Have you prepared a statement for the information of the Committee upon the subject of the Chinese emigrations?—I have.

"Will you have the goodness to read it?"

(The witness then read the same, as follows:)

"A VIEW of the Emigrations of the Chinese to the various countries adjacent to China.

"The emigrations of the Chinese take place from the same provinces, which conduct the foreign trade; viz. Canton, Fokien, Chekien, and Kiannan. Emigrations from the two latter, however, are not frequent, and seem to be confined to Tonquin and the Phillippine islands. The emigrants direct their course to every country in the neighbourhood of China, where there is any probability of finding employment and protection; in some countries, however, they are excluded or restrained, from political motives, and in others, distance or want of room affords them no encouragement to settle. Like the European nations, they are excluded altogether from settling in Japan, on political grounds; the government of Cochin China also affords them no great encouragement, from the same reason, and the Dutch and Spanish governments of Java and the Phillippines have always looked upon them with a considerable share of suspicion. Distance, but above all, the existence of a dense and comparatively industrious population, excludes them from the British dominions in Hindostan, where we find only a few shoemakers and other artisans, and these confined to Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. A few, I understand, have lately proceeded to the Mauritius.

"Every emigrant who leaves China does so with the intention of returning to it, although comparatively few are able to accomplish this object. The expense of emigration to the countries to which the Chinese usually resort, amounts to but a mere trifle. The passage-money in a Chinese junk from Canton to Sincapore is but six Spanish dollars; and from Fokien but nine. Even these

slender sums, however, are commonly paid from the fruits of the emigrant's labour on his arrival, and are seldom paid in advance. The emigrants, I think, are invariably of the labouring classes, and their whole equipment for the voyage in ordinary cases consists of little else than the coat on their backs, a bundle of old clothes, and a dirty mat and pillow to sleep on. They no sooner land than their condition is prodigiously improved; they meet their countrymen, and probably their friends or relatives; they find immediate employment in a congenial climate, and in countries where the wages of labour are perhaps three times as high as in China, and the necessaries of life perhaps by one-half cheaper.

"The Chinese are not only intellectually, but physically superior to the nations and tribes among whom they settle. A Chinese is at least two inches taller than a Siamese, and by three inches taller than a Cochin Chinese, a Malay, or a Javanese; and his frame is proportionably strong and well built. Their superiority in personal skill, dexterity, and ingenuity are still greater. All this is evinced in a very satisfactory manner, by the simple criterion of the comparative rates of wages of the different classes of inhabitants or sojourners at any given place where they all meet. At Singapore, for example, the wages of ordinary labour for the different classes of labourers are as follow: A Chinese, eight dollars a month; a native of the Coromandel coast, six dollars; and a Malay, four; making the work of the Chinese by one-third better than that of the first, and by 100 per cent. better than that of the second. When skill and dexterity are implied, the difference is of course wider; a Chinese house-carpenter will earn twelve dollars a month, while an Indian will earn no more than seven; and a Malayan thatcher or wood-cutter, for among this class there are no carpenters, but five.

"The different classes of Chinese settlers not only live apart, and keep distinct from the settlers of other nations, but also from each other. There is a very wide difference between the character, habits, and manners of the Chinese settlers, according to the parts of China from which they proceed. *The natives of Fokien have a claim to a higher tone of character than any of the rest.* Among the emigrants from the province of Canton there are three classes; viz. those from the town of Canton and its neighbourhood; the natives of Macao and other islands in the river; and the natives of some mountainous districts of the same province. The first of these, besides being addicted to mercantile pursuits, are the best artizans, and are much disposed to enter into mining speculations. It is they who are chiefly engaged in working the silver mines of Tonquin, the gold mines of Borneo, and the Malay peninsula, and the tin mines of the latter country and of Banca. The Chinese of Macao and the other islands are held in very little repute amongst the rest of their countrymen; but the third class, who are numerous, are the lowest in rank. Their most frequent employment is that of fishermen and mariners; and it is from among their ranks that the European shipping, when in want, have occasionally received hands to assist in their navigation. Of all the Chinese these are the most noisy and unruly. There is still another class of Chinese, the settlers in the Birman dominions, who differ very remarkably from all that I have just enumerated. With the exception of a small number of emigrants from the province of Canton, who find their way to Ava by sea, they are all from the province of Yunan, and in point of industry and intelligence seemed, as far as I could judge, much superior to the colonists from Canton and Fokien. From all these again, the mixed races are to be distinguished by their superior know-

ledge of the language, manners and customs of the countries in which they reside, and by some inferiority in industry and enterprise. It is from this class that European merchants are supplied with brokers, money-counters, &c. and they are seldom to be seen in the condition of day-labourers or artisans. The Chinese settlers, of whatever class, engage with much eagerness in agricultural employments, seldom, however, when they can avoid it, as mere day-labourers. They conduct almost exclusively the cultivation and manufacture of the catechu or terra japonica in the Straits of Malacca, the pepper cultivation of Siam, and the culture of the cane and manufacture of sugar in Java, Siam, and the Phillipines, Differing materially from each other in manners, habits, and almost always in language or dialect, and entertaining towards each other provincial prejudices and antipathies; broils and quarrels, sometimes even attended with bloodshed, frequently break out among them. These are occasionally subjects of embarrassment in the European settlements, the authorities of which have never, I am persuaded, any thing to apprehend from their combination or resistance; and I may add, that of all the Asiatic settlers in our eastern settlements, the Chinese are most obedient to the laws, and notwithstanding the superior amount of their property, and even of their numbers, afford the least employment to the courts of justice.

"The Chinese population settled in the various countries adjacent to China, may be roughly estimated as follows—

The Phillipine islands	15,000
Borneo	120,000
Java	45,000
The Dutch settlement of Rhio, Straits of Malacca	18,000

Sincapore	6,200
Malacca	2,000
Penang	8,500
Malayan Peninsula	40,000
Siam	440,000
Cochin China	14,000
Tonquin	25,000
Total	734,700

"The population mentioned here is of a peculiar description, consisting, for the most part, of adult males, and of very few women or children, a circumstance easily explained. *The laws of China, which prohibit emigration in general, are a dead letter, as far as the men are concerned,* but it is imperative with respect to women and children, *or perhaps, more strictly, the manners and feelings of the people themselves prevent the latter from quitting the country.* I have never seen or heard of a female amongst the emigrants, and never saw a Chinese woman, except at Hué, the capital of Cochin China, where two or three were pointed out to me as objects of curiosity, who had been kidnapped and brought there when children. The emigrants, however, without scruple, form connexions with the females of the country, and the descendants of these repeatedly intermarrying with Chinese, are in time not to be distinguished from the genuine Chinese, either in features or complexion. In all the countries where the Chinese have been established, there exists a considerable creole population of this description, such as Java, Siam, Cochin China, and the Phillipines. But in countries where they have been only recently established, the disproportion of the sexes is immense. Thus, out of the 6,200 Chinese inhabitants of

Sincapore, the number of female is about 360, and even of these the greater part are Chinese only by name. The extent of the annual emigrations from China may be judged from the fact, that the number which arrived at Sincapore in 1825, amounted to above 3,500, and in 1826 to upwards of 5,500. The annual number of emigrants which arrived in Siam, was rated to me, when I was in that country, at 7,000. A single junk has been known to bring 1,200 passengers; indeed, I have myself seen one bring 900 to Sincapore. The number who return to China is considerable, but very small indeed in comparison to the arrivals. Even of these the greater number come back again; and I have known men of property, who have visited China, and returned with titles."

No. II.

PROOFS OF THE RAPIDITY WITH WHICH WASTE LAND RISES IN VALUE, WHEREVER PEOPLE CONGREGATE, IN NEW COLONIES.

Mr. Stuart.

"The population of Troy has increased from 3,000 in 1810, to 12,000 in 1830. Property is very valuable. A tenement 65 feet by 25 feet, was pointed out to me as having been lately sold for 4,000 dollars."

"Mr. Sloat has lately sold 200 acres of wood land, (near Newbury on the Hudson) which he bought from the States in 1801 for 50 cents the acre, at an immense advance."

"Colonel Colman gives a very favourable account of Florida, where the soil is good by the river side. He himself has purchased 900 acres on the banks of the Appalachicola, all of excellent land, for which he paid 9,000 dollars."

(On the Mississippi about 300 miles from New Orleans) "we had excellent butter-milk at one of our *stopping places* for wood, occupied by a tenant, who pays 4 dollars an acre of yearly rent for a few acres of ground."

"In many places on the banks of the Ohio, a great deal of fine alluvial land, which, I was informed sold for 10 or 12 dollars per acre."

"Large fortunes have been made (at Rochester which in 1818 contained 1,000 inhabitants, and in 1828, 13,000) by the purchase and sale of building lots."

"A million of acres, which are rapidly increasing in value."

"The appropriation of land for schools, many of which have become very valuable."

"Real property of all kinds at New York brings great prices. The *site* of a house, at the corner of two central streets, 29 feet in one street and 130 in the other, was lately sold for 38,100 dollars."

"To those who would purchase land *with a view to profit*, I would rather recommend the banks of the Hudson, within 30 or 50 miles of New York, where the farmers have succeeded in establishing steam boats, *to carry their produce daily to the city*."

"It may, however, be worth while to mention that plenty of improved land is to be had in the neighbourhood of Cincinnati, *varying in price according to its distance from the town*."

"In fact the extent of country, which the United States have acquired since the treaty of 1783, far exceeds three hundred millions of acres in the very heart of their territory, besides the boundless regions to the north and north-west. A great proportion of this prodigious extent of land remains with the general government, and must in the course of years produce to the United States *some thousand millions of dollars*."*

THE REVEREND J. FIDLER,

Author of Observations on the United States and Canada.

"The value of land in Canada is increasing regularly and rapidly. For instance, Younge Street was first settled thirty-seven years ago. At that time land on it was given to any one who applied. A few years after land was worth from 50 to 100 dollars. A lot of about 200

* Say one thousand millions of pounds sterling; or more, by a fourth, than the English national debt.

acres is now worth from 1,000*l.* to 2,000*l.* on many parts of Yonuge Street. In the beautiful township of Oro, *lately settled*, land a short time ago was 1 dollar per acre: it is now worth from 4 to 5, and increases in value from half a dollar to a dollar every year. On the Huron tract, it is now selling at from 1 to 2 dollars. *Emigration is setting in that way;* and the probable consequence will be that land there, in two or three years, will be double that sum. Land has generally been found to double itself every three or four years."

"In the towns of Kingston, Brockville, &c. land is almost as high as in many parts of England; whilst at a small distance from these towns it can be purchased, *usually good*, at 2 or 3 dollars. In York Town, an acre is sometimes worth 1,000*l.* or 1,200*l.* A little remove from this, *uncleared* land is worth 6 or 8 dollars; and a few miles further off, not perhaps above 2 dollars. If railroads be formed, plans of which have been laid before the legislature, and acts passed to legalize them, the land now selling at 2 dollars, would soon be worth 10*l.*"

Communicated by Mr. Cattermole of York, Upper Canada, and published in an Account of the South Australian Land Company.

"When the town of York was founded, much of the contiguous land was given away to favourites, who expected that the increase of population by natural means, and by immigration, would give it value. They have not been disappointed. A person named Elmsley possessed some of this land, and when King's College was founded the site (about 5 acres) was purchased by government of Mr. Elmsley for 1,200*l.* Fifteen years previously, this land would not have sold for 2 dollars per acre."

"Mr. John Masson, a tinman, living in King Street, York, took in 1830, a lease for 21 years, of a piece of

land in York, measuring 23 feet in front by 80 feet deep, at a ground rent of 17*l.* 10*s.* currency, per annum; and on 40 feet being added to the depth, the ground rent was raised to 22*l.* per annum. Fifteen years before this land would not have sold for more than 3 or 4 dollars per acre."

"Mr. Francis Collins, editor of the Canadian Freeman, purchased by public auction in July 1831, a quarter of an acre of waste land in York for 600*l.* currency."

"Mr. M'Cullum sold in July 1831 a village lot, situated on Dundas Street, nineteen miles from York, at the rate of 300*l.* per acre of currency."

"In the last seventeen years, the land *within fourteen miles of the Erie canal,* has risen from 25 cents (quarter of a dollar) to 16 dollars."

Mr. Pickering (late of Fenny Stratford),

Author of the Emigrant's Guide to Canada, 1830.

"Been to ask the price of land to *rent* (near Baltimore, U. S.) One lot of 50 acres, *only half cleared,* 4 miles from town, 18 shillings per acre per annum: another of rich meadow land, several miles off *near the river,* I was asked 12 dollars or 2*l.* 14*s.* per acre *rent.*"

"Building lots of land (in York) within the last year or two have risen in value very fast, *on account of the seat of government being decided to remain here for some years to come.*"

"Niagara to Queen's town, and indeed round the head of the lake to Dundas, Ancaster and Hamilton, a fine country, genial air, healthy, well watered *and settled:* land is from 30 shillings to 4*l.* 16*s.* per acre."

"Farms sell here (on the banks of the Detroit river) from 45 shillings to 3*l.* 10*s.* per acre: a house and some buildings included."

Mr. Wentworth (of New South Wales),

Author of an Account of Australasia. 1823.

"The price of land, it is almost needless to observe, is entirely regulated by its situation and quality. In the towns, it is as various as in the country; nor is there any place in which the variation in value is so great as in the town of Sydney itself. There it ranges from 50*l.* an acre to 1,000*l.*"

"With respect to the value of what is termed forest land, when in a state of nature and not possessing any advantageous locality, it may generally be taken thus: In the county of Cumberland," (the county in which Sydney is placed) "15 shillings per acre; in the county of Camden, including the district of Illawarra or Five Islands" (farther from market) "10 shillings per acre; on the banks of the Coal River" (still farther from market) "5 shillings per acre: *in parts more remote,* 2 shillings and 6 pence per acre."

"In the course of thirty years the tract of land in question (the banks of the Hawkesbury), taking the unimproved land as our criterion, has evidently risen to this enormous price from having been of no value whatever; or, in other words, each acre of land has increased in value, during the interval which has elapsed since the foundation of the colony, at the rate of 3 shillings and 2½*d.* per annum; and that too, under the most impolitic and oppressive system (of government) to which any colony perhaps was ever subjected."

Mr. Boucher (of New South Wales),

Communicated to Mr. Robert Gouger.

"In the year 1831 Mr. Wentworth sold near two acres of land situated in the main street, and near the King's

Wharf Custom-house, Sydney, for 7,800*l.*, the whole of which, ten years previously, might have been bought for 350*l.*"

"In 1828 Mr. Unwins bought 6 acres of land on the Surrey Hills, about 1 mile from Sydney, for 650*l.*; and in 1830 the same land was resold for 1,800*l.*"

"In 1829 Mr. Bettington purchased a piece of land situated at Cockle Bay, Sydney, comprising a frontage of about 150 feet, and a depth of about 200 feet, adapted for a wharf, &c. for 609*l.* This land in 1831 would have realized, exclusive of the buildings, about 2,000*l.*"

"In 1830 Mr. Simeon Lord received from the local government 6,000*l.* as an arbitration award for about 2 acres of land situated near Government House, Sydney. He would gladly have sold it ten years previously for 250*l.* or 300*l.*"

"Early in 1828 Madame Rens bought at auction a piece of ground in the main street of Sydney, on the site of the old Orphan School, comprising a frontage of 150 feet and depth of 80 feet, for 1,200*l.*; and in 1829 sold *half* of the same plot to Mr. Horton James for 1,800*l.*

"In the latter end of 1827 Messrs. Cooper and Levey purchased from Captain Piper for 25,000*l.* the estate of Point Piper, situated 4 miles from Sydney town. This estate consisted of 500 acres of land, having an extensive frontage to part of Sydney Harbour, with a large house, pleasure grounds, &c. It would now readily fetch 150,000*l.*, if divided into allotments of 2 or 3 acres each (for villas) and sold by auction at a moderate credit."

"Building allotments in Sydney town, in a fair situation, comprising a frontage of 60 feet and a depth of 80 feet, could be readily purchased in 1825 for from 70*l.* to 150*l.* In 1830 they usually brought at auction from 600*l.* to 1,500*l.*, according to their situation."

"On the Parramatta road, at from 2 to 5 miles from Sydney, land, having a frontage to the road, could be purchased in 1825 for 5*l.* to 12*l.* per acre: it now fetches from 30*l.* to 150*l.* per acre."

"On the South Head road, at from 1 to 3 miles from Sydney, similar land could have been bought for 3*l.* to 10*l.* per acre: it now fetches from 30*l.* to 100*l.* per acre."

"In the township of Maitland, Hunter's River (70 miles from Sydney) uncleared land could be readily purchased for 1*l.* or 2*l.* per acre in 1825: it is now worth from 5*l.* to 100*l.* per acre, *according to situation.*"

"Land having a frontage to the main road, in Maitland, and not far from the court-house, is now sold for building on at from 30*l.* to 150*l.* per acre, which in 1825 would not have produced from 3*l.* to 5*l.* per acre."

"In 1827 Mr. John Smith purchased a small farm of 60 acres from Mr. Allen, situated near the town of Maitland, Hunter's River, for 250*l.* This farm has a frontage to the main road of about 10 acres; and these 10 acres would now sell for 1,200*l.*, or 120*l.* each."

From Mr. Curr's *Account of Van Diemen's Land*, 1824.

"The value of *uncultivated* land in the colony varies much according to situation and quality. Until of late, grants of land were sold and exchanged very currently, *without being* actually located by the settler (buyer): and the price varies from 10 to 20 shillings per acre."

"The rent of houses in Hobarts Town is very high. A cottage consisting of four to six rooms, lets for 60*l.*, 70*l.* and 80*l.* per annum: a house of two floors containing eight or ten rooms, for 120*l.* to 150*l.* per annum: and if in an advantageous situation, 200*l.* will be given for it."

"Farms are very frequently rented in Van Diemen's Land."

"Other persons are induced to make unequal exchanges: giving their uncultivated lands *for smaller farms in more populous situations.*"

CAPTAIN SUTHERLAND,

Communicated to the South Australian Land Company.

"Captain Sutherland, twelve years ago, received from Governor Macquarie a grant of 1,000 acres within 4 miles of Launceston in Van Diemen's Land. He has expended upon it no money whatever, in roads, buildings or other improvements. Being obliged, however, to stock it, he expended 200*l.* in horned cattle and sheep, and put them upon it. It is now worth 2*l.* per acre; the value being given by the increase of population in the neighbourhood."

"Captain Barclay received at the same time with Captain Sutherland a free grant of 4,000 acres of land, about 7 miles from Launceston. He has expended in building and improvements about 4,000*l.*; and he has let on lease for 10 years at 1000*l.* a year."

Practical Notes made during a Tour in Canada in 1831, *by* ADAM FERGUSSON, *of Woodhill.*

"Much has been said of the rapid advances which the Upper Province is making, and of the rising value of property there. I was told of a case which occurred about thirty years ago, where a lieutenant in the army, being £50. in arrear to a Montreal merchant, insisted, along with his promissory note, on handing over a lot of land assigned to him somewhere in the *then* Western Wilderness, a security which the poor merchant regarded as

much upon a par with the subaltern's note, who was about to leave Canada to join his regiment. The allotment consisted of 1,250 acres upon the lake Ontario, of which *seven hundred* were sold last year for *seven hundred pounds*, and *five hundred and fifty* acres of the best quality reserved. Such are the changes which time effects, without the aid of any other agent, and such cases, I was assured, are by no means rare." (Page 69.)

"Emigrants, unable or unwilling to purchase, will have little difficulty in providing themselves with a farm to rent, either for money or on shares, which means half the clear produce as rent. I was told by a gentleman of a friend of his, who was very comfortably settled in this way near York, upon a farm of 200 acres. Eighty acres are cleared, the remainder in wood pasture. He pays only 25*l.* of rent, and clears 200*l.* per annum, besides keeping his family.

"To show how land is advancing in value, this farm, a few years ago, might have been purchased for 200*l.*, but is of course worth a great deal more now." (page 275.)

"In the afternoon we reached Brandtford, a pretty considerable village belonging to the Indians, a tract of land in this quarter having been reserved for their behalf. It is managed by government, who account for rents and sales to the chiefs. There had been a sale of village lots this day, and for the first time I saw the Indians assembled in any numbers. The lots sold for 25*l.*, one-fourth of an acre, which is an immense price in Canada, and argues an expectation of Brandtford continuing to prosper." (page 286.)

"The first farm which I visited was in the immediate vicinity of Albany, forming part of the princely estate of M. Van Ransalaer. It contained 600 acres of fine mellow loam along the banks of the river, divided into fields by rail-fences, which cost here 4*s.* 6*d.* for sixteen feet,

including boards, nails and work; four rails and about five feet high.

"The farm was let some years ago at 2,000 dollars, or 450*l.*, which, in America, seems to be a very high rent; but it must be recollected that its situation is particularly favourable from its close contact with the thriving city of Albany." (page 293.)

In the year 1817, Mr. Robert Gourlay* circulated through Canada a number of queries, for the purpose of ascertaining facts relative to the state of that colony, amongst which the following question was submitted.—"THE PRICE OF WILD LAND AT THE FIRST SETTLEMENT OF THE TOWNSHIP; ITS PROGRESSIVE RISE AND PRESENT PRICE; ALSO OF LAND SO FAR CLEARED; STATING CIRCUMSTANCES AS TO BUILDINGS, PROPORTION CLEARED, OR PECULIARITY, IF ANY, OF LOCAL SITUATION; REFERRING IN EVERY INSTANCE TO ACTUAL SALES?"

This question was answered by committees formed from among the resident owners in various townships. The answers follow:—

TOWNSHIP OF SANDWICH, IN THE WESTERN DISTRICT,

Settlement commenced in 1750, *and contains at present* (1817) *about* 1,000 *souls.*

"The price of wild land about 20 years ago was 1*s.* 3*d.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* per acre, and its progressive rise about 2*s.* 6*d.* for every five years. The present price of land is from 10*s.* to 15*s.* except in particular situations, such as lie on the straight. No lands have been recently sold in the township; the settlement has been long at a *stand.* Improved farms on the border of the straight, with a common farm house, barn, and out-houses, orchard, and about 50 acres within fence, would rate from 2*l.* 10*s.* to 6*l.* 5*s.* per acre, and more, according to the situation and value of the improvements."

* See Gourlay's Historical Account of Upper Canada, Vol. I, page 269, et seq.

TOWNSHIP OF WALDEN IN THE WESTERN DISTRICT,

Settlement commenced in 1784; *present population* 675 *persons.*

"At first settlement, the price of land was from 1*s.* to 3*s.* per acre; the present price is 25*s.* per acre; some land partly cleared has been lately sold at 40*s.* per acre.

TOWNSHIP OF RALEIGH, WESTERN DISTRICT,

Settlement commenced in 1792; *present population* 273 *persons.*

"At the commencement of the settlement, lots of 200 acres situated on the banks of the Thames, were sold at 25*l.* In 1804 they sold for 131*l.* 5*s.* The same lands are now selling for 250*l.* without improvements. Back lands of the best quality may be fairly estimated at one-third of these prices."

TOWNSHIPS OF DOVER, EAST AND WEST CHATHAM, CAMDEN, OXFORD, HOWARD, AND HARWICH, ON THE RIVER THAMES.

Settlement commenced in 1794; *inhabited houses* 133.

"Some farms in good local situations, with tolerable buildings and orchards thereon, well cultivated, containing 200 acres of land, sold for 690*l.* The average price of lands from the first settlement of these townships, was from 2*s.* 6*d.* to 20*s.* per acre."

TOWNSHIPS OF DORCHESTER, DELAWARE, AND WESTMINSTER ON THE RIVER THAMES.

"The flats on the Thames have always sold high, and are now worth 3*l.* per acre."

TOWNSHIP OF OXFORD, IN THE LONDON DISTRICT.

"A two hundred acre lot, with thirty acres cultivated land, a log house and frame barn 30 by 40 feet, is worth 500*l.*"

TOWNSHIP OF WINDHAM, IN THE LONDON DISTRICT.

"At our first settlement, wild land sold for 5*s.* per acre; at present the wild land in the unsettled parts of the township will sell for 10*s.* per acre; but there is wild land in the settlement that cannot be bought for 1*l.* 5*s.* per acre; and some improved farms are held at 3*l.* 15*s.* per acre, where there is not above 60 acres improved; but there have been actual sales of farms from 1*l.* 5*s.* to 3*l.* per acre, according to the improvement made in them."

TOWNSHIP OF CHARLOTTEVILLE, IN THE LONDON DISTRICT.

"About the first settlement of the township, land sold for 5*s.* per acre, but will now average about 1*l.* A farm of 200 acres of land, with a log-house and barn, with 50 acres cleared and fenced, and a small orchard of bearing trees, might be purchased for about 700*l.* and occasionally less."

TOWNSHIP OF NORWICH, IN THE LONDON DISTRICT.

A few families arrived in 1808, *but very little progress was made till* 1811.

"About 6*s.* 3*d.* was at our commencement the price of land, and has progressively risen in value to 13*s.* per acre; one sale lately made of an improvement, 100 acres, 35 cleared, frame barn, log-house, good fence, price 375*l.*"

TOWNSHIPS OF WEST FLAMBORO' AND BEVERLY, GORE DISTRICT.

"Wild lands at first settling, sold for 10*l.* per 200 acres; and now sell from 10*s.* to 1*l.* 10*l.* and 2*l.* per acre. Cleared land sells from 2*l.* to 12*l.* 10*s.* per acre, according to its situation and advantages."

TOWNSHIP OF ANCASTER, IN THE GORE DISTRICT.

"Wild lands at the first settling of this township sold at 6*l.* 5*s.* per lot of 200 acres; now sell from 12*s.* 6*d.* to 1*l.* 10*s.* and 5*l.* per acre. Cleared lands sell from 2*l.* 10*s.* to 12*l.* 10*s.* per acre, according to its situation and advantages.

TOWNSHIP OF BARTON IN THE GORE DISTRICT.

"In 1792, land sold at 1*s.* 3*d.* per acre; in 1800, 5*s.*; in 1806, 15*s.*; in 1810, 1*l.* 10*s.*; in 1817, about 2*l.* 10*s.* On an average about 5*l.* per acre, for an improved farm of 200 acres, with small farms, or log-house and barn, and other out-houses. Improved farms have sold from 6*l.* 5*s.* to 7*l.* 10*s.* per acre."

TOWNSHIP OF SALTFLEET IN THE GORE DISTRICT.

"The price of new land in this township, at the first settlement thereof, rated so low as to make it no object with many. A lot of 100 acres might be purchased for 5*l.* to 6*l.* 5*s.*, and large quantities were actually bought and sold at these prices: it has gradually rose from that time to the year 1812, since which time it seems stationary for want of purchasers. But the average price of wild land may be rated at 1*l.* 5*s.* per acre. A farm of about 300 acres of land, one third cleared, and a comfortable

house and good barn, with a bearing orchard of one or two hundred apple trees, the whole premises being in good repair, may be purchased from 1,000*l.* to 1,500*l.* according to situation. A farm nearly answering to this description was actually sold for the highest sum here mentioned."

TOWNSHIP OF HUMBERSTON, NIAGARA DISTRICT.

"At the first settlement, when much land was held on location tickets, lots of 200 acres could be bought for twenty dollars. The price has gradually increased, and of late years sales have been effected at 2½ dollars per acre."

TOWNSHIP OF WILLOUGHBY, IN THE NIAGARA DISTRICT,

Surveyed and laid out by order of government in 1787.

"A farm of 200 acres, one half under cultivation, with tolerable farm buildings and orchard, now sells for 625*l.* to 700*l.* Farms, however, upon the Niagara or Chippewa rivers, will sell much higher, according to their situation."

TOWNSHIP OF GRANTHAM, IN THE NIAGARA DISTRICT.

"Farms of 200 acres, situate on the most public roads, of a good quality, comfortable house, good barn, orchard, &c. from 100 to 150 acres improved, will sell for 6*l.* to 7*l.* 10*s.* per acre. Farms of 100 acres, small house and barn, 60 acres improved, will sell from 5*l.* to 6*l.* per acre. Lands in the village of St. Catharine, (the only one in township) in 1809-10 and 11, sold for 6*l.* 5*s.* per acre, now sell from 30*l.* to 200*l.* for building lots."

TOWNSHIP OF PELHAM, NIAGARA DISTRICT.

"When the settlement of this township commenced,

wild land was selling at 6*l.* 10*s.* for 100 acres; in the year 1800, at 10*s.* per acre; the present price is 40*s.* per acre."

TOWNSHIP OF CROWLAND, NIAGARA DISTRICT.

"A farm of 100 acres, nearly contiguous to mills, with about 40 acres cleared, and very neat buildings, was sold for 312*l.* 10*s.*"

TOWNSHIP OF HALDIMAND, NEWCASTLE DISTRICT,

Settlement commenced in 1797.

"At the first settlement of the township, lands were worth 5*s.* per acre; at the present time, in good situations, 15*s.* and in ordinary situations, 10*s.* per acre."

TOWNSHIP OF KINGSTON, MIDLAND DISTRICT,

Settlement commenced in 1783; *population, including the town of Kingston,* 2,850.

"Few or no actual purchases of land were made by the original settlers, as their situation entitled them to grants from government. . . . . Farms of 200 acres, with perhaps 60 or 80 acres cleared, with a house and barn, and within a range of 10 miles of the town, may be worth from 2*l.* to 5*l.* per acre."

"At the first settlement, many persons sold their 200 acre lots for the value of a few shillings; twelve years ago, land a few miles from Kingston, sold for 2*s.* 6*d.* per acre; and lately, in the same situations, from 30*s.* to 40*s.*; but the fire-wood alone will soon be worth as much as that per acre."

TOWNSHIP OF EARNEST TOWN, INCLUDING AMHERST ISLAND, MIDLAND DISTRICT.

"At the first settlement the value of wild lands was merely nominal. They have progressively risen, and

their present price may be computed at 1*l.* 5*s.* per acre. The average price of 100 acres of land, one half improved, with tolerable buildings thereon, may be valued at 3*l.* per acre."

TOWNSHIP OF ADOLPHUS TOWN, MIDLAND DISTRICT.

"At the first settlement of this township, land could be purchased at 1*s.* per acre. It rose gradually to 5*s.*, 10*s.*, 15*s.*, 20*s.*, &c. At this moment there is no land in the township could be procured for less than 4*l.* per acre, and it is believed few would sell at that price."

TOWNSHIP OF SOPHIASBERG, MIDLAND DISTRICT.

"At the first settlement, land was about 1*s.* per acre; there is little wild land for sale here; best sales made from three to five dollars per acre."

TOWNSHIP OF LANSDOWN, JOHNSTOWN DISTRICT,

Settlement commenced in 1788.

"Price of wild land, at the first settlement, it was sold at 5*l.* for 200 acres, and has gradually risen in value to one dollar per acre, at a distance from the settlement; but on the road or river it may be valued at three dollars per acre, and that without any improvement; in the centre of the town from three to six dollars per acre."

TOWNSHIP OF CHARLOTTENBURGH, EASTERN DISTRICT,

Settlement commenced in 1784.

"The price of wild land, for the first period, say six years of the settlement, was from 1*s.* to 5*s.* per acre; and at present, is from 20*s.* to 30*s.* the acre. A lot of 200 acres, with 30 acres cleared, under good cultivation, with a farm-house and barn with sheds, &c. is worth from 500*l.* to 600*l.*

Travels in America in the years 1794, 1795, *and* 1796, *by the Duke of Rochefoucault Liancourt.*

Vol. 1. pa. 6. Land in this neighbourhood (Philadelphia), is worth 80 dollars per acre, 6 years ago it was only worth 42.

Vol. 1. pa. 77. General Haud bought 5 years ago the estate on which he resides, 2 miles from the town, for 25 dollars per acre; and has lately refused 100 dollars which were offered him. The price of land has risen in the same proportion throughout America, as land in the cultivated parts.

Vol. 1. pa. 98. The price of ground shares in the town of Harrisburg (founded 8 years before) is from 150 to 200 dollars per acre, the land in the surrounding country is from 32 to 48 dollars per acre.

Vol. 1. pa. 195. The inhabitants only settled here (Painted-post, State of New York) four years ago. The soil is good, especially near the town, where from 15 to 18 dollars is the price for an acre.

Vol. 1. pa. 261. — Metcalf, 3 years ago, purchased his estate for 1*s.* per acre: of the thousand acres he then bought, he has already sold 500 and upwards, at from 1 to 3 dollars per acre, and some have fetched 25 dollars. The profits which are made by speculations in land, all over America, and especially in this neighbourhood (Genesser) are great beyond calculation.

Vol. 2. pa. 10. W. Shorten bought his estate here (Oswego), 3 years ago, at 3*d.* per acre, and can now sell it for 12*s.*: only 10 acres are cleared.

Vol. 2. pa. 39. The land here (Schuylerton) which in 1785 cost a few pence per acre, and 3 years ago not more than 5 dollars, is now sold not merely in the vicinity of the town, but also 15 miles beyond it, for 19 or 20 dollars per acre.

Vol. 3. pa. 242. The settlement of the country between Harper's Ferry and Coosooky Mountains, is just beginning. Land fetches from 7 to 8 dollars the acre.

Vol. 4. pa. 161. Belvidere consists of about 20 houses, but the number of inhabitants is annually increasing, and the neighbourhood is populous. The lands in the neighbourhood are sold at from 40 to 48 dollars the acre. The town lots, which are a quarter of an acre, being at present from 100 to 125 dollars.

No. III.

PART* OF A CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT AND A BODY OF INDIVIDUALS DESIROUS TO FOUND A COLONY.

PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE

Of the South Australian Land Company.

W. Wolryche Whitmore, Esq. M. P. Chairman.

George Fife Angas, Esq.	W. A. Mackinnon, Esq. M. P.
Dominic Browne, Esq. M. P.	J. A. S. Mackenzie, Esq. M. P.
H. L. Bulwer, Esq. M. P.	Samuel Mills Esq.
Walter F. Campbell, Esq. M. P.	John Melville, Esq.
Henry Drummond, Esq.	Sir R. Musgrave, Bart, M. P.
Captain Gowan.	Richard Norman, Esq.
Richard Heathfield, Esq.	J. E. Strickland, Esq.
Samuel Hoare, Esq.	Colonel Torrens, M. P.
William Hutt, Esq.	George Traill, Esq. M. P.
J. Jephson, Esq. M. P.	R. Throckmorton, Esq. M. P.
C. Shaw Lefevre, Esq. M. P.	Sir H. Williamson, Bart. M. P.
Lord Lumley, M. P.	

---

* During the late session of Parliament, Mr. Hutt, one of the members for Hull, requested Lord Howick to agree to a motion for a return of the *whole* of this correspondence. His lordship said that he should oppose the motion; on account of the expense of printing. On the same account, I can give here only a part of the correspondence: but this part of it is enough to show the *animus* on both sides; and it leaves the government with the last word.

Copy of a Letter from Mr. R. W. Hay, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, to Mr. Wolryche Whitmore, M. P. for Bridgenorth.

Downing Street, 30th May, 1832.

SIR,

Lord Goderich has received the note which you addressed to him on the 28th instant, with its enclosure, containing "a Proposal for founding a British Colony in South Australia, between the degrees of longitude 132 and 141, both inclusive, to extend northward to latitude 20, inclusive, and to include Kangaroo Island and the other islands on the south coast under a Royal Charter;" and I am directed to acquaint you that after having given to the subject his best consideration, he has come to the determination of withholding the sanction of his Majesty's Government to the undertaking.(1)

Independently of the objections which he should feel himself called on to make to several of the propositions which are brought forward, as well from their novelty, as from the difficulty which he foresees in regard to their practical operation, he cannot but consider that great public inconvenience would arise from the circumstance

(1) It would appear by the terms of this paragraph, as if Lord Goderich had decided the question in two days, between the 28th, the date of Mr. Whitmore's letter, and the 30th, the date of Mr. Hay's. Let us do his lordship justice: the subject had been before him for a whole year, as will be seen further on; but why should Mr. Hay omit all notice of this fact, and write as if Lord Goderich had never heard of the subject till the 28th of May, 1832?

of a new colony being placed so near to the penal settlements at Sydney and in Van Diemen's Land, as that proposed.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servant

(Signed) R. W. HAY.

W. W. Whitmore, Esq. M. P. &c. &c.

Copy of a MEMORIAL addressed to Viscount Goderich, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies; in answer to the above.

Office of the South Australian Land Company,
8, Regent Street, June 4, 1832.

The undersigned, being members of a Provisional Committee formed for the purpose of founding a colony on the south coast of Australia, persons desirous to settle in the proposed colony, and others taking a deep interest in the matter, have perused, with surprise and sorrow, a letter addressed by Mr. Hay to Mr. Whitmore, dated May 30; wherein it is stated, that "Lord Goderich has come to the determination of withholding the sanction of His Majesty's government from their undertaking:" and they now take the liberty of submitting to Viscount Goderich a statement of the grounds, on which they are led to hope and trust, that his lordship will be pleased to reconsider his decision in this matter; confident that, when all the circumstances of the case shall be examined, Viscount Goderich will not persist in his present determination.

I. That the proposal submitted to Viscount Goderich by Mr. Whitmore, as chairman of the Provisional Committee, on the 28th ultimo, is not a new proposal, but was submitted to Viscount Goderich in much greater

detail, and in a printed form,(2) during the autumn of last year; when a deputation consisting of Colonel Torrens, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Gouger and Mr. Graham, waited upon Viscount Goderich for the purpose of ascertaining his lordship's opinion of that proposal. That the members of the deputation were so well pleased with the opinion which Viscount Goderich expressed of their undertaking, that they thought it needless to ask for any written reply to their proposal, but advised the persons whom they represented to proceed with the undertaking, by submitting the intended charter to the law officers of the crown, and raising the necessary capital.

II. That a notice of the proposed colony having appeared in a newspaper, in which it was stated that his Majesty's government had given their unqualified sanction to the undertaking, Viscount Howick, under-secretary of state for the colonies, then superintending the Australian department,(3) addressed to Mr. Bacon a memorandum in the following words.

Colonial Office, 13th Oct. 1831.

"I was surprized to see in the Spectator newspaper of yesterday, an assertion that the government had given its sanction to the plan for the establishment of a chartered colony in Australia. This statement is not strictly correct. It is a mistake to suppose that any official sanction has been given to the plan. The only approba-

(2) *Proposal to His Majesty's Government for founding a Colony on the Southern Coast of Australia.* 1831.

(3) The Australian department was soon afterwards taken from Lord Howick and given to Mr. Hay.

tion which has been expressed, was conveyed by myself(4) verbally to Major Bacon; and in the conversation I had with him, I distinctly informed him that I was *authorized* to promise nothing; and that I merely expressed my own opinion, being ignorant of that which Lord Goderich might entertain,(5) as I did not consider the scheme sufficiently matured for his decision.

"The substance of what I said in this un-official manner was this, that I myself thought very favourably of the project; and that doing so, I was anxious that it should be laid before Lord Goderich in such a shape as to be most likely to meet with his approbation.(6) For this purpose, I advised the modification in the original project, with respect to the number of inhabitants who should be considered sufficient for the introduction of a representative government, and with respect to the nomination of the governor, which have since been made.(7)

(4) This is not strictly correct. The deputation had had a long interview with Lord Goderich, whom they found reading their printed proposal, and who suggested two alterations in it, which were immediately adopted. What Lord Goderich said of the plan at that interview, and how far he spoke officially, will be seen further on.

(5) Just so; but Lord Goderich had very distinctly expressed his own opinion, unknown to Lord Howick; and the notice in the Spectator referred, not to the opinion of the under-secretary, but to that of his chief.

(6) It had been already, unknown to Lord Howick, laid before Lord Goderich, in the shape of a printed pamphlet of 31 pages.

(7) Both these alterations were also suggested by Lord Goderich, to the deputation which waited on his lordship; and it was these suggestions by the principal secretary of state, which, amongst other things, led the

I further suggested that the draft of the charter, which it was desired to obtain, should be prepared and submitted to the attorney general;(8) and I stated that if this draft, approved by him and accompanied by a respectable list of subscribers, were brought under the consideration of Lord Goderich, and if it should be clearly made to appear that the government would be put to no expense, I had little doubt that Lord Goderich would recommend that the charter should be issued.(9) With respect to the difficulty that was stated to exist about obtaining subscriptions without having received the sanction of Government to the scheme, I said that, in my opinion, what would be the fairest for all parties would be, that the draft of the charter should be submitted to Lord Goderich, with a list of subscriptions *conditional* upon the sanction of the Government being granted; and that, upon the draft being approved by Lord Goderich, the sum subscribed for should be actually paid up, or at least a certain proportion, before the charter should actually issue; that thus the subscribers would run no risk of being drawn in to contribute to an unsanctioned project, and the Government would equally avoid all

---

deputation to conclude that he approved of their enterprise.

(8) Lord Goderich, himself, had made the very same suggestion.

(9) This caution and modesty were very becoming in a young nobleman new to office; but Lord Goderich, an experienced statesman, had already spoken for himself in decisive terms; one of the grounds on which he thought so well of the plan being that, upon the face of it, the government was not to be put to the expense of a single shilling for any purpose whatever.

danger of giving their countenance to a scheme which there were not funds to support.

(Signed) H."

III. That the document recited above was considered as confirmatory of the opinion of the undertaking expressed by Viscount Goderich to the deputation which had waited on his lordship, and as intended only to provide that the conditions, on which the sanction of his Majesty's government had been required, should be strictly fulfilled before such sanction should be officially expressed.

IV. That on the 16th of April last, a deputation, headed by Mr. Whitmore, waited upon Viscount Goderich for the purpose of ascertaining whether his lordship continued to entertain a favorable opinion of the enterprise; and that the impression left on the minds of the deputation by Lord Goderich's reception of them was, that his lordship continued to entertain a favorable opinion of the project generally, though there might be points of detail requiring modification.

V. That the parties interested in the undertaking farther held several conversations with Viscount Howick, and other gentlemen of the Colonial Department, and especially with Mr. Stephen, the counsel of that department, whereby they were led to believe that His Majesty's government viewed their undertaking, not merely with approbation, but with a very warm interest.(10.)

VI. That in consequence of the belief arising from

---

(10) Thus far Mr. Hay had not been concerned with this affair.

Viscount Goderich's reception of the deputations above mentioned, from Viscount Howick's memorandum, and from the conversations just alluded to, the parties interested in the undertaking have been constantly occupied, for great part of a year, in measures, having for object the fulfilment of conditions which they conceived to be required by his Majesty's government; such as circulating pamphlets, with a view to bring the subject before the public, raising the necessary capital, procuring evidence as to the soil and climate of the south coast of Australia, preparing a draft of the proposed charter, and forming the company under whose auspices the proposed colony was to be founded.

VII. That their progress in these measures was greatly retarded, and on two occasions entirely suspended, by the votes of the House of Lords on the reform bill; but that by dint of the constant labour of a considerable number of persons, the whole of whose time has been devoted to this object, they had, as they imagined, overcome every difficulty; and that the late communication from Mr. Whitmore to Viscount Goderich, whereby the original proposal (11) was briefly repeated, was made for the purpose of informing his lordship of their success, (12) and of obtaining that official sanction to their enterprise without which it was impossible that they should adopt any final step.

---

(11) With the alterations that Lord Goderich had suggested.

(12) After this, Mr. Hay's mention of the proposal as if it had been entirely new, seems unaccountable. Was it a joke? or, as the proposal was indeed new to Mr. Hay, did he speak sincerely enough, meaning himself when he said "Lord Goderich"?

VIII. That, though the want of an official expression of the sanction of his Majesty's government necessarily prevented them from opening shares to the public, still that, of the 500,000*l.* which it is proposed to raise, the persons who intended to settle in the colony, proposed to subscribe 100,000*l.*; and that many of them, in order to carry this their purpose into effect, as well as to provide themselves with capital for use in the colony, have disposed of real and other property in this country to a considerable amount; that several of them have abandoned trades and professions in which they were engaged; have purchased outfits and other goods for exportation to the colony; and will be subject to a very serious loss of property (not to mention the loss of their time) in case the hope on which they have acted should, at the eleventh hour, be frustrated by his Majesty's government.

IX. That persons, who do not propose settling in the colony, have intimated their intention of subscribing 100,000*l.* of the capital.

X. That, with reference to Mr. Hay's letter to Mr. Whitmore of the 30th ultimo., it must be acknowledged that the proposal submitted to Viscount Goderich is distinguished by some novelty; since never before did a body of capitalists offer to any government so large a sum as 125,000*l.* for 500,000 acres of land, completely waste and in a country absolutely desert.

XI. That in two other respects the plan is distinguished by novelty: in the first place, as it promises a continually increasing fund for the purpose of pauper-emigration; and secondly, as it provides, though but in one case, against the evils which, in all the colonies of

modern times, have resulted from the want of any fixed or rational system in the disposal of waste land. (13)

XII. That in other respects, the proposal submitted to his Majesty's government, instead of being distinguished by novelty, is founded on precedent; the English government having invariably, it is believed, except in the case of the late Swan River colony, adopted the principle of self-government in the formation of colonies. That in the case of every colony, properly so called, founded by this country, the home government gave its sanction to that compact amongst the first settlers, which led to the foundation of the colony; a compact of which the essence was, that the colonists should govern themselves in local matters, and provide for the expenses of local self-government. (14)

XIII. That although no public announcement has yet been given of the intention of the proposed company to convey poor settlers to Australia, a mere rumour of that intention has led poor persons (nearly all of them without

(13) These gentlemen may have known how to found a colony; but it is evident that they did not know how to deal with a corrupt old government. Their *naïveté* in dwelling on two points, which would have rendered impossible all jobbing with new land, or with the purchase-money of it, is almost laughable.

(14) Here, again, the simplicity of Mr. Whitmore and his coadjutors is almost amusing. Governments love precedent, when it makes in their favour: in this case, it could not but be offensive to notice those precedents, of which the memory is held in dislike at the English colonial office; and to notice them, too, for the purpose of getting the best of the argument with a minister.

employment, and many of them in a state of great destitution) who, together with their families amount to upwards of six thousand, to apply for the benefit which the mere sanction of his Majesty's government would enable the company to bestow on them. (15)

XIV. That the proposed undertaking is not open to the objection against the establishment of colonies, which is held by many enlightened persons; viz. an objection to the expense which colonies often occasion to the mother-country, and to the great amount of patronage which they place at the disposal of a minister at home: since, in the present case, it is provided that all the public expenses attendant on the colony should be borne by the colonists themselves, and that the officers, so to be paid for administering the government of the colony, should not, the governor excepted, be appointed by the secretary of state. (16)

XV. That, with reference to Mr. Hay's letter to Mr. Whitmore of the 30th ultimo, in which it is stated that "great public inconvenience would arise from the circumstance of a new colony being placed so near to the penal settlements of Sydney and Van Diemen's Land,"

(15) One of these, having been told that the government had changed its mind and that the scheme was at an end, said: What! the reform government? Yes, was the answer, even the *reform* government!

(16) Worse and worse. What else could they expect but to be treated as they were? Why did they not rather dwell on their confidence in the secretary of state, as shown in their having given up to him, at his own suggestion, the appointment of the governor?

it is acknowledged that the proposed colony would present a remarkable contrast with the penal settlements of Australia; a contrast of all that is good in colonization with all that is bad; local self-government, instead of arbitrary rule; a rational and fixed system in the disposal of waste land (one of the elements of colonization), instead of a system which, though based on the plan devised by the projectors of the proposed colony,(17) is rendered almost nugatory by previous want of system, and is dependent for its duration on the pleasure of the secretary of state for the time being; a society concentrated by that rational system in the disposal of waste land, and enabled to employ their capital and labour with the greatest advantage, instead of a society dispersed by the profusion of the government in granting waste land, and so prevented from raising commodities which require combination of capital and labour; a moral society, or at least a society placed under circumstances the most favorable to morality, instead of a society pre-eminently vicious, in which the most disgusting depravity prevails, and in which such vices are becoming national habits. The contrast, would, no doubt, have been most striking. But the undersigned are at a loss to see in what way the establishment of so much good by the side of so much evil could be productive of "public inconvenience." On the contrary, they submit to Viscount Goderich, that the want of a costless, concentrated and civilized colony in Australia, furnishes a very strong reason why the home government, not being called on to incur any expense or to create any patronage,(18) should enable the under-

(17) The plan of the *Colonization Society*, just then adopted by the government, as to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land.

(18) There again: always touching the sore place.

signed to establish such a settlement in that part of the world: so that there may be one British colony at least, in a favorable climate, to which persons of all classes may resort, without incurring political, social or moral degradation.

XVI. That the only "public inconvenience" which the undersigned can imagine to be alleged as likely to result from the establishment of a self-governed colony in Australia, is, that the settlers in the penal colonies, not being convicts, would thereby be led to ask of the home government the advantage of self-government in local matters. But in answer to this supposed allegation, the undersigned venture to remark, that already the free settlers of the penal colonies earnestly beg for, and are bent on obtaining, the advantage in question; that, for any thing that has been stated to the contrary, they are entitled to this advantage; and that they might enjoy it without hindrance to the penal system. If, however, it were clear that the establishment of a self-governed colony near to the penal colonies, would *create* a demand for self-government amongst the settlers of those penal colonies; and if it were farther proved that self-government in local matters is incompatible with the penal system, still the undersigned would take the liberty of reminding Viscount Goderich, that the whole system of penal transportation is condemned by some jurists and politicians, as being not less costly than ineffectual as a punishment; and that in all probability, and in accordance too with the views of the present government, that system of pretended punishment and colonial depravity will not much longer be followed. Consequently, it appears to the undersigned, that, if the objection which they presume to be alleged by Mr. Hay's letter to Mr. Whitmore were not removed, it would

amount on the part of his Majesty's government to a decision, That, because some public inconvenience might by possibility arise, and, if at all, for but a short time, by contrasting the best with the worst mode of colonization in Australia, therefore, none but the worst system should be adopted in any part of that vast region.

That the vicinity of the proposed colony to the penal settlements is calculated to remove an objection, which was stated by Viscount Goderich to the deputation headed by Mr. Whitmore on the 16th of April; namely, that the establishment of a colony at *such a distance* from the penal colonies might be injurious, by extending the line to be protected in case of war. But, if the latter objection should be urged, the undersigned would observe that since the formation of the Swan River colony, the whole of the south coast of Australia ought to be defended in case of war; and that the establishment of a colony in the centre of that coast, midway between Van Diemen's Land and the Swan River, would greatly facilitate such defence.

XVII. That if the above considerations should not remove Viscount Goderich's objection to the new colony, which is founded on the possibility of public inconvenience, the undersigned would further point out to his lordship, that a British settlement, not penal,(19) and one to which it appears inevitable that the advantage of self-government in local matters will be accorded as soon as the settlers are sufficiently numerous, already exists in Australia; namely, the Swan River colony, which extends to King George's Sound.

XVIII. Finally the undersigned submit to Viscount

(19) But costly, they did well not to add.

Goderich, that when a number of persons are disposed to incur the risks and hardships of planting a colony in a desert country, the social arrangements under which they shall exist are, and have always been considered by the British government, matters in which the settlers alone are deeply interested, and of which they are the best judges; that, in the present case, the intended settlers have formed a plan of colonization, which, if it succeed, must inevitably be productive of great advantage, not merely to themselves, but to this nation at large, by opening a great field for the employment of our surplus labour and capital; and that, in order to carry into effect this purpose of unqualified good, the utmost extent of their request to his Majesty's government is, that it will exercise one of the functions for which governments exist, by binding, under a charter from the crown, the compact into which those individuals are desirous to enter.

(Signed)

W. W. Whitmore, (M. P.)
Robert Torrens, (M. P.)
J. E. Strickland.
Richard Heathfield.
W. A. Mackinnon, (M. P.)
J. A. Stewart Mackenzie, (M. P.)
Wm. Gowan, Upper Baker Street.
J. Melville, Upper Harley Street.
F. Place, Charing Cross.
William Hutt, 54, Conduit Street.
Thomas Hoskyns, (M. P.)
Thomas Rudge, Hereford.
Robert Gouger, Castle Street, Falcon Square.
Benjamin Hanson, Bruton Street.
D. Elston, Bridge House, Limehouse.
Robert Price, (M. P.)

Henry Drummond, Charing Cross.
Samuel Hoare, Lombard Street.
C. Lushington, Edgeware.
G. Long, Tanfield Court, Temple.
Samuel Mills, 20, Russell Square.
L. Thomas, Cheapside.
A. Bacon, North Bank.
R. Sadlier, Fulham.
D. Munro, Kensington.
D. Wakefield, Gray's Inn.
G. A. Angas, Jeffrey Square, St. Mary Axe.
G. S. Tucker, Birchin Lane.
G. J. Graham, Gray's Inn.
R. Phillips, (M. P.) Portland Place.
George Vardon, Charles Street, Westminster.
H. L. Bulwer, (M. P.) Albany.
Samuel Brookes, Islington.
R. D. Hanson, Hackney.
Richard Borrow, Stepney.
William Borrow, ditto.
William Currie.
John Cobden, Canterbury.
J. Rhodes, Bankside.
J. Evans.
G. Morrison, Soho Square.
E. C. Richards, George Yard, Lombard Street.
D. Browne, (M. P.)
Charles Hanson, Hackney.
John Cunnold.
R. Throckmorton, (M. P.)
R. Heathfield, Jun. Lincoln's Inn.
H. Surman, Lincoln's Inn.
W. H. Surman, Lincoln's Inn.
Erskine Humphreys, Lincoln's Inn.
J. H. Rice, North Bank, Regent's Park.

J. Harding.
M. Racster.
Alex. M'Math.
Andrew Smith, Birchin Lane.
Joshua Storrs.
F. B. Robinson.
W. Hanson, Hackney.
Joshua Brookes.
George Drury.
John Bowes, 54, Conduit Street.
G. S. Rutherford, Welbeck Street.
G. C. Hawkins, Regent Street.
J. S. Lumley, (M. P.) Park Street.

To the above Memorial, no answer was returned. Two interviews, however, took place between Lord Goderich and deputations from the society.

At the first of these meetings, Lord Goderich urged several new objections to the undertaking. The Letter, accordingly, of which a copy follows, was addressed to his lordship by Mr. Strickland, who, during Mr. Whitmore's absence from town, acted as chairman of the Provisional Committee.

South Australian Land Company's Committee Room,
8, Regent Street, June 18, 1832.

My Lord,

As chairman of a meeting of the South Australian Land Company, held this day, I have the honour to address your lordship on the subject which was discussed between your lordship and a deputation from that committee on Friday last. (20)

---

(20) At this meeting there were present, besides the

Before noticing the objections to the proposed colony which were urged by your lordship on that occasion, I would venture once more to remind your lordship, that the proposal now before you is by no means a new one; but that it was submitted to you so long as nearly twelve months ago. This assertion will be borne out by the following relation of facts.

Early in the month of June last year, Mr. Gouger, in consequence of a conversation with Viscount Howick, delivered to his lordship a paper entitled *Proposal for establishing a new colony in South Australia.* On the 11th of the same month, Viscount Howick addressed a letter to Mr. Gouger, of which I have the honour to

---

Provisional Committee, a considerable number of the gentlemen who had made arrangements for settling in the proposed colony. They were in a state of anxious excitement, such as can be imagined by him only, who knows after how painful a struggle people, having strong ties at home, make up their minds to emigrate; and how earnestly, when they have come to that decision, they think, to the exclusion of all other thoughts, upon their prospects of happiness in the new country. It was a scene for Wilkie to have painted: the minister seated, cross-legged, with an air of official gravity and importance; the under-secretary standing behind a high desk, a sort of apology for not being seated in the presence of his chief; the petitioners watching every expression of the great man's face; their own faces lighted up when he uttered a word that seemed favourable to them, and pulled lengthwise when he spoke of objections; the little-great man suggesting objections from behind the high desk, and when the would-be settlers stared as if they would eat him, looking down steadily upon a bundle of papers tied with red tape.

inclose a copy marked A, and by which Mr. Gouger was directed to renew the proposal in a different form. Consequently, another proposal was drawn up, printed, and forwarded to Viscount Howick, who submitted the same to your lordship; and your lordship was pleased to appoint a time when you would receive a deputation from the persons interested in forming the intended colony, for the purpose of giving them some answer to the proposal in question. The deputation, which consisted of Colonel Torrens, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Graham and Mr. Gouger, waited on your lordship, and read a paper containing the heads of the printed proposal, which, however, they found in your lordship's hands, and of which you were pleased to say, that you had read it with much interest, and that its subject matter was of so much importance as to deserve your immediate and serious attention. One objection (21) your lordship made to the proposal; viz., to the proposed appointment of the governor by the company. (22) In all other respects it appeared to the deputation, not merely that your lordship assented to the proposal generally, but that you felt a considerable interest in the undertaking, which, if successful, was calculated to effect so much good. So

---

(21) This is a mistake: there were *two* objections; one to the appointment of the governor by the colonists; the other to the number of people (5,000 male adults) who, it was proposed, should have a legislative assembly. Both points were conceded: Lord Goderich was to appoint the governor; and for 5,000 male adults, 10,000 was substituted by Lord Goderich's desire.

(22) The appointment of the governor was vested in the colonists by the charters of Massachusetts Bay, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.

satisfied were the deputation with your lordship's feeling on the subject, that, upon subsequent consultation amongst the parties interested, they recommended that your lordship should not be asked for any written answer to the proposal; on the ground that such a request would be ungracious to your lordship, as savouring of a suspicion, which was most distant from the thoughts of the deputation, that your lordship's favourable reception of them might not have been sincere. (23)

Within a few days of the interview in question, Mr. Bacon, who happened to be at the Colonial Office on other business, was called aside by Viscount Howick (who at that time, it should be remembered, conducted the Australian department) when a conversation

---

(23) There can be no doubt that Lord Goderich's favourable reception of these gentlemen was perfectly sincere. But it may be doubted whether, at that time, he had looked to the consequences which might result from *the example* of a very cheap colony in Australia. One who is well acquainted with the English government, having been told of the success of this deputation, said—"They do not understand your plan: as soon as they understand it they will oppose it. If you want the sanction of the government, you must put a good deal of patronage into your plan: this plan is too cheap, altogether too good, ever to be liked by our government. Instead of 5,000*l.* a year for governing the colony, say 20,000*l.* a year; and give all the appointments to the colonial office. If you do this, you will get the charter without trouble: if you hold to the present plan, you will never get a charter, except by appealing to the house of commons; and not then until there shall have been two or three elections under the reform bill."

occurred of which a minute in writing was immediately made by Mr. Bacon, and communicated to the persons with whom he was acting. Of that paper I have the honour to inclose a copy, marked B. The next communication between the colonial office and the intended colonists was made by Viscount Howick's memorandum, dated October 31, 1831, which was copied into the memorial presented to your Lordship on the 4th instant.

After this long, and I fear, tiresome recital, your lordship will, I trust, acknowledge, that I am correct in representing the proposal before your lordship as by no means a new one, but as one which was formally submitted to you, in a complete shape, last year, and which did then obtain your serious attention. If this had not been the conviction of the intended colonists, or if they had imagined that your lordship had entertained any one serious objection to their project, instead of occupying themselves, as they have done, with other measures for carrying the project into effect, they would either have sought to convince your lordship that any objections held by you were ungrounded, or would have requested your lordship to suggest alterations in their place, calculated to make it entirely agreeable to you. Indeed, on the two points, which did occur to your lordship as objectionable, viz. the appointment of the governor by the company, and the amount of population which should be entitled to local self-government, they immediately altered their plan to meet your lordship's views; and all their subsequent publications have contained those alterations.

Your lordship will, therefore, be able to appreciate the great disappointment which they have suffered at finding that now, when they have laboured for a year to fulfil the conditions on which they had every reason to be confident that a charter would be given to them, numerous

and grave objections have been for the first time mentioned; objections which, had they occurred last year, would either have been removed, or would have saved the trouble, the loss of time, the loss of property, and the pain of frustrated hopes, which must ensue unless they be now removed.

I proceed to notice the objections which were stated by your lordship on Friday last, or at the interview on the 16th of April last.

First in importance is that which supposes, that a number of intelligent men should have wildly neglected to ascertain whether the spot, on which they desire to settle and pass the remainder of their lives, be sufficiently fertile for the purposes of colonization. On this head, I have to remark that your lordship never so much as hinted at any doubt concerning the fertility of the soil, until such a doubt was expressed by Mr. Whitmore on the 16th of April last; that the doubt which had occurred to Mr. Whitmore has been entirely removed, as is shewn by a resolution of the provisional committee (24)

---

(24) "At a meeting of the Provisional Committee, 21st May, 1832; present

W. Wolryche Whitmore, Esq. in the chair.

Colonel Torrens, M. P.	C. Fife Angas, Esq.
William Hutt, Esq.	J. Jephson, Esq. M. P.
Samuel Mills, Esq.	John Melville, Esq.

After considering the Evidence contained in the printed pamphlet, entitled—*Evidence relating to the soil, climate, and productions of the South Coast of Australia;* hearing the evidence of Dr. Rutherford and Mr. Riley; reading that of Mr. Mearing; reading a *Sydney Gazette,* wherein is set forth the contract prices of meat and bread

passed unanimously on the 21st of May last (of which I have the honour to inclose a copy marked C); that this is a point which, if his Majesty's government had been about to found the colony, they ought to have ascertained from the beginning; but that, whereas, in point of fact, the colony, if founded, will be altogether (according to ancient and most successful practice) the work of individuals, not his Majesty's government, but the individuals concerned are deeply interested in the question: that the individuals concerned have examined this question with the deepest anxiety, and have arrived at the conclusion, that they run no risk of meeting with a soil not fit for colonization: that, even if such risk existed, it would involve no greater possible evil than the disappointment of those individuals, since the vicinity of the site of the proposed settlement to the settlements of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, where food is not merely plentiful but superabundant, puts out of question the privations which have occurred to the founders of many new colonies; the proposed settlement being, as relates to food, not a new colony but a new settlement in an old colony over supplied with food; (25) and, finally,

---

in Sydney, viz. beef $\frac{3}{4}d.$ per lb., mutton $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per lb. and bread $1\frac{1}{4}d.$ per lb.; also reading extracts from Captain Sturt's Journal: it was resolved unanimously—That the evidence this day submitted to the Committee, in respect of the soil, climate and productions of Kangaroo Island, and the shores of the Murray River, and Lake Alexandrina, is sufficient to warrant the formation of a colony on those lands with all possible dispatch."

(25) With animal food, which is become a drug in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, as it is in Buenos Ayres.

that the objection urged by your lordship would, if maintained, be an objection to the foundation of a colony any where; since it would be hard to obtain a body of evidence as to the soil of any desert country so favourable as that of which I have the honour to inclose a copy marked D. (26) Of the capacity of any desert soil for colonization there must always exist a doubt until the experiment be made: but to say that the existence of such a doubt furnishes a reason for not making the experiment, appears directly contrary to reason. (27)

And here I venture to request your lordship's particular attention to a point which has been made prominent in every step taken by the projectors of the colony; which appears in the proposal submitted to your lordship last year, in the published plan of the company, and in the prospectus lately submitted to your lordship; viz. that the first outlay of the company is to be *by way of experiment*, the sum to be employed not to exceed 5*l.* on each share of the capital subscribed, or, in the whole, 50,000*l.* In confirmation of this statement, I venture to quote the following passage from the published plan of the company. "The plan pursued by it will be to send out in the first instance a small expedition, for the purpose of examining whether the site proposed for the new colony offer the advantages which have been supposed to attach to it. This may be done at a moderate expense. If the result should be favourable, the agents of the

(26) This is a printed pamphlet.

(27.) If for a doubt as to the soil, we read a doubt as to the convenience of self-government and extreme cheapness of government, this objection, coming from the colonial minister, will seem rational enough.

company will select for the first settlement the spot which seems to them the most suitable." Thus your lordship will see, that the doubt, which must exist in every case as to the fertility of the soil of a desert country, has not been lost sight of in the present instance, but has led to arrangements which render the first intended expedition nothing more than a sufficient experiment.

Nevertheless, as those who have the deepest interest in the experiment trust and believe that it will prove successful, so were they bound to provide for its success. The case of failure is provided for by the vicinity of other settlements superabounding in land, in food, and in demand for labour. The case of success is provided for by the proposed charter; in order that if a colony be founded, it may not be left without any social regulations; in order that if a settlement be planted on the shores of Spencer's Gulph, the settlers paying for the land, those first settlers may not be ruined by subsequent gifts of land to others who may follow them; in order, briefly, that if the first settlement succeed as to the question of soil, it may not prove a miserable failure in all other respects.

The next objection urged by your lordship was, the the evils that might arise from the resort to the new colony of run-away convicts from the penal settlements. Now, the fact is, that Kangaroo Island has been for many years, and is at this time, a place of refuge for run-away convicts; that in that island such persons have formed a society remarkable for existing without any social ties, and for the prevalence of the most horrid crimes; that convicts in the penal settlements are thus invited to escape, no power existing to prevent them from inhabiting the south coast of Australia; and that if a settlement were formed on that coast, instead of any evil so to be caused, an effectual stop would be put to the evil which

already exists. (28) In illustration of the state of the people who are settled on Kangaroo Island, I venture to mention the following fact, which is stated by Dr. Barnes, a gentleman of great respectability now resident in London.

Dr. Barnes, being in New Zealand, met with an Englishman who some years before, had, in a fit of madness, attempted to destroy himself. His lower jaw was shot away in the attempt. Recovering his senses, ashamed of what he had done and of his frightful appearance, he sought to hide himself from the sight of civilized men, and to pass the remainder of his life in a state of savage excitement. With this view he selected as a place of refuge Kangaroo Island, where he could obtain the society of men more degraded than himself. It should be further remarked, that the savage settlers of Kangaroo Island seize native women from the main land, whom they treat as slaves, and by whom they have children; so that there is every prospect, unless some counter measure be adopted, of the existence of a band of dangerous pirates in the spot, which it is now proposed to convert into a civilized colony.

The third objection, which appeared to weigh with your lordship, was the apparent want of any motive for founding a new settlement in Australia, when three settlements are already established there. In answer to this objection, if it may be so termed, I am requested to refer

(28) Acting upon this lesson, the government has, I am told, ordered a crown settlement to be made on this coast, where it was proposed to found a chartered colony. If it be so, and they should now be asked to enable individuals to found a colony there, without expense to the mother-country, the reform government may say—Oh dear no: the country is already settled.

your lordship to the signatures appended to our memorial of the 4th instant, and to say, that many of the gentlemen who signed that document intend to settle in the proposed colony; but that no consideration would induce them to settle in New South Wales, where, such is the state of society, there are, allowing for the difference of population, 325 public executions for 1 in England; and where, moreover, nameless crimes prevail, and are becoming, as in Turkey, national habits. Those gentlemen also request me to say, that the accounts which they have received of the Swan River Settlement, of the ruin and misery which have befallen the more wealthy emigrants to that colony, render it impossible that they should settle in a colony where, by the profusion of the government in granting land, the people are dispersed and pauperized; and where there is no security for the inestimable advantage of local self-government.

Finally, your lordship was pleased to dwell on the responsibility which his Majesty's government might incur, by giving its sanction to the proposed undertaking. To this objection there would be no answer, if his Majesty's government had originated the undertaking, or were called upon to take active measures for promoting and conducting it. But the fact is, that, as in the case of our oldest and most successful colonies, as in the case, it is believed, of every colony founded by Englishmen, the Swan River colony only excepted, the undertaking originates with, and is to be wholly conducted by, certain individuals deeply interested in every step that they may take, fully conversant with the subject, and influenced by the strongest sense of responsibility; which body of individuals ask no more of his Majesty's government than that it will enable them to carry into effect their own purpose, by their own means, and on their own responsibility. For the partial failure of the Swan River

Settlement, the government who founded the settlement without any provision for success, is no doubt responsible; but the Plymouth Company and William Penn, not the governments of the time, were responsible for the success of the colonies of Virginia and Pennsylvania. And it may be said further, recurring to principles which have often been eloquently advocated by your lordship, that the two last named colonies flourished so greatly, because, not a distant government, but the individuals most deeply concerned, were responsible for every act performed. It is true that, in the present case, the individuals concerned can perform no act without a charter from the crown; but your lordship will allow me to observe, that the crown is empowered to grant charters for the express purpose of enabling bodies of men to act in concert in matters which involve no evil to the public. Consequently, it appears to me, and in saying so I speak the expressed opinion of many of my coadjutors, that unless there be upon the face of the proposed undertaking some prospect of evil, such as it is the business of government to prevent, his Majesty's government could not incur any responsibility, by merely enabling a number of men to act in concert, for the accomplishment of their own purposes, by their own means, and, I repeat, on their own responsibility.

But I venture humbly to suggest to your lordship, that the responsibility of frustrating so great and good an object, by refusing so small a boon, is one deserving consideration.

Referring to what fell from your lordship as to the propriety of submitting so important a question to his Majesty's ministers, I have to state, that, except on the score of delay and suspense, which are most distressing to many of the persons interested in this question, we should be gratified to learn that your lordship had laid

the question before the cabinet; confident that the more our plan shall be examined, the more will it be thought worthy of support by an enlightened and liberal administration. (29.)

In conclusion, I am instructed to say, that if there be any modification of the plan, which would render it more agreeable to your lordship, the parties concerned will readily adopt the same, unless it would interfere with the main principles of their scheme: but they are unable to suggest any alteration, because no part of the plan has been adopted by them without much enquiry and reflection; nor could any part of it, in their sincere opinion, be changed without an alteration for the worse.

I have the honour to be, My Lord,
With the highest respect,
Your lordship's most obedient humble servant
(Signed) J. E. Strickland.

To the Right Honourable Lord Viscount Goderich,
His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies.
&c. &c. &c.

To the above letter no answer was returned; but Lord Goderich intimated his wish, that any further discussion should be carried on verbally. At the interview, when the objections were made to which the above letter was intended as an answer, Mr. Hay was present, and suggested most of the objections. An interview now took place, at which Mr. Hay was not present, between Lord Goderich and a deputation from the committee. On this occasion (of which a particular account has been pre-

(29) Like the hungry workman, who had set his heart on getting fat in the new colony, these gentlemen seem to have placed too much dependence on a *reform* government.

served), Lord Goderich suggested some alterations in the plan, and these being agreed to by the deputation, appeared to abandon all his objections. His manner was courteous, and he appeared to feel for the many families then waiting in the most painful suspense for his decision. He desired that a draft of the proposed charter, with the alterations then proposed and agreed to, might be forwarded to him without delay; and the deputation reported to their constituents that, as far as they could judge from his lordship's manner and language, the charter would be speedily granted. On the 9th of July, accordingly, a draft of the proposed charter was delivered at the colonial office, together with a letter from Colonel Torrens, to Lord Goderich. To this letter, the following curious answer was returned by Mr. Hay.

Downing Street, 17th July, 1832.

SIR,

I am directed by Lord Goderich to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 9th instant, inclosing the draft of a charter for the incorporation of the South Australian Land Company, and to acquaint you for the information of the gentlemen of the Provisional Committee, that his Lordship has bestowed the most careful attention upon the various provisions of that instrument. As the transmission of the proposed charter affords the first occasion which has presented itself during the discussions on this subject, for taking a clear and comprehensive view of the plan of the company in all its bearings,(30) Lord Goderich has entered on the enquiry with a full conviction, that nothing which has hitherto occurred

(30) The great convenience of making this mistake may be some excuse for having made so great a one.

can be supposed by the parties more immediately concerned to preclude His Majesty's Government from their free and unfettered discretion on the general principles and the particular details of the scheme.(31) Whatever deliberations may have intervened between the original suggestion of the measure and the delivery at this office of the draft of a charter, they have all taken place upon the assumption, that the proposal, when drawn out in its ultimate form, would be found compatible with the fundamental principles, to which it is the duty of the King's Government to adhere in every grant which they may advise his Majesty to pass under the Great Seal; and it is of course obvious that this condition must at all times have been distinctly understood.(32.)

On examining the draft which you have transmitted, Lord Goderich finds that in many important particulars it goes far beyond the proposition as he originally understood it to be conceived;(33) that it would virtually

(31) That is, translating these fine gilt-paper terms into plain English, all which had gone before was to be counted for nothing. This, certainly, was not "supposed by the parties more immediately concerned." From the tone of the government, *after Mr. Hay became its organ*, one should be led to suppose, that these petitioners, instead of asking for a piece of parchment, had been requesting Mr. Hay and Lord Goderich to emigrate along with them.

(32) Of course: but it was also understood that, when Lord Goderich expressed his approval of the fundamental principles, &c., he knew what they were, and really meant what he said.

(33) "Beyond;" in which direction? towards liberalism or toryism? The draft of a charter embodied the

transfer to this company the sovereignty (34) of a vast unexplored territory equal in extent to one of the most considerable kingdoms of Europe;(35) that it would encroach on the limits of the existing colonies of New South Wales and Western Australia; (36) that it is proposed to throw open the settlement to foreigners as well as to British subjects, in such a manner as at once to place them upon a complete equality;(37) that the objects of the corporation are defined with such latitude of expression as to exclude no conceivable employment

---

less liberal provisions as to the governor and the legislative assembly, which Lord Goderich had suggested.

(34) It had always been proposed that the company should govern the colony until the settlers were numerous enough to govern themselves.

(35) This is a mistake. The only creatures, over which sovereignty could be transferred, are a few savages and a great many kangaroos and emues. It is true, that the space, within which all waste land was to be sold, and the colonists were to govern themselves in local matters as soon as there should be colonists, was very large. But the charter mentioned exactly the same space as the original proposal,

(36) This is a mistake: those colonies have no defined limits. The nearest part of the outside of the proposed colony to any settlement in Australia would have been some hundreds of miles from any settlement.

(37) I am not aware that "foreigners" were ever mentioned either in writing or verbally by any one connected with the colony; but it was certainly provided in the charter, that all the poor people taken to the colony with the purchase-money of waste land should be British subjects.

of their capital;(38) that the actual investment of that capital, or any part of it even, is not necessarily to precede the issuing of the charter; (39) that the charter would invest the company with a power of legislation and would even enable them to delegate to others the exercise of that trust, without taking the very least security against the possible abuse of so high an authority;(40) that the company would enjoy the right of erecting courts, and of appointing and removing judges and other officers;(41) that they claim the power of raising and

---

(38) What the Company should do with its capital was stated distinctly. Would Mr. Hay have had the charter recite all the things which the company should *not* do with its capital.

(39) The Committee had been imploring Lord Goderich to promise, only to promise, the charter officially, in order that subscriptions for the capital might be received. Lord Goderich had been told, too, that the intended settlers were ready to subscribe 100,000*l.* of that capital, and that they had disposed of real and other property with that view.

(40) In this respect, the draft of a charter was a copy from the charters, under which Companies founded colonies in America. At one of the interviews with Lord Goderich, his lordship had been requested to examine those charters, copies of which probably exist in the colonial office. A printed copy of them was in the hands of the committee.

(41) Of course, if the company were to govern for a time, like the London Company, and the Plymouth Company, and William Penn, and even the Company which founded a colony at Sierra Leone, it was, during that time, to have the authority necessary for governing.

commanding the militia; that they would exclude the king from the exercise of that power of imposing duties of customs which Parliament has entrusted to him throughout the Eastern colonies;(42) that a freedom of trade is claimed, to which the navigation and trade acts, as they now stand, are opposed;(43) that all the powers of the company, extensive as they are, and involving in their practical effect the sovereign dominion of the whole territory, are ultimately to be transferred to a popular assembly, (44) which would be to erect in the British monarchy a government purely republican; (45) and that the company would be the receivers of large sums of public money (46) for the due application

---

(42) Not the king, but the clerks in Downing Street, who legislate for New South Wales and the Swan River. Every provision, however, as to trade, was subject to existing laws; and of course a charter could not affect an act of parliament. That very power which parliament has given to the king, his Majesty was requested to exercise in this case.

(43) A great mistake. This charter could not have applied to any ports, save those of the colony; and even there, could not have interfered with any act of parliament.

(44) Of course; since one chief object of the plan was, according to ancient and approved practice, to establish local self-government in the colony.

(45) If the company should revive their project, they would do well to put a House of Lords into it; with a Baron Blackswan, a Viscount Kangaroo, a Marquis of Morrumbidgee and a Bishop of Ornithoryncus.

(46) Only for repayment of their private money, with which they proposed to defray all the cost of government

of which they do not propose to give any security. (47)

Other objections might be stated to the plan proposed in this draft; but for the present Lord Goderich forbears to enter on any discussion of them. His lordship deems it sufficient to have pointed out those which I have already referred to; and directs me to say that, if the various departments of government which must be consulted should concur in a scheme involving such extensive consequences, as would follow from the adoption of that which is proposed, (48) they could not legally carry it into effect without the express sanction of Parliament; (49) but his Majesty's Government could not recommend to Parliament a measure so entirely subversive, in one part of His Majesty's dominions (50) of those royal prerogatives, which, for the common benefit of all his subjects, it is His Majesty's duty to maintain. (51)

I am, Sir,
your obedient humble servant,

Colonel Torrens, M. P. (Signed) R. W. Hay.

---

and defence until the colony should be able to repay them.

(47) The application of the money was clearly defined: it was to be applied in repayment to the company of their advances for the government and defence of the colony.

(48) The admission is worth notice, that the plan was calculated to accomplish the objects of those who formed it.

(49) Very many English colonies have been founded by charter: not one, it is believed, by act of parliament.

(50) A complete desert, save as to the run-away convicts, over whom, certainly, his Majesty exercises no dominion.

(51) Fudge!

Extract from the Morning Chronicle of September 23rd, 1832.

"We invite attention to a letter of Mr. Gouger upon the subject of the South Australian Land Company, which will be found in another column. Upon the merits of the proposed company we shall abstain from remarking at large now; as, it seems, a pamphlet is to be published, containing the whole of the correspondence with Government upon the subject, accompanied by a sketch of the original plan. It is, however, clear that any proposition supported by such men as formed the Provisional Committee, and of which the object was to provide a place of refuge for six thousand poor persons, ought not to have been rejected by the Colonial Office without very good reasons. No one will say that the committee was not sufficiently influential, and high in character, to support any wise measure they chose to commence: neither are they men from whom we should be led to expect any other than a practical and attainable project.

"From the fact of difficulties occurring only after the Australian colonies were placed under the controul of Mr. Hay, the *Tory* under-secretary of state for the colonies, it may be inferred that the plan was opposed by Mr. Hay, and was therefore abandoned. We have more than once had occasion to reprobate the practice of the present ministry, in keeping about them men whose principles are diametrically at variance with their own. A Tory of principle and honour will naturally object to measures founded upon liberal principles: an unprincipled Tory will lose no opportunity to serve his party, by *bringing his opponents in politics into disrepute*; although he may, at the same time, be eating the bread of liberal employers.

Both classes, therefore, should be avoided equally. Mr. Hay is a Tory. Educated in the school of Lord Melville, he has been the constant attendant of all succeeding ministers. If it should turn out that a spice of liberalism, in the shape of self-government, appeared in the plan of the company or colony, we have no doubt the ministers will have to thank their Tory under-secretary for any odium or unpopularity they may experience from the rejection of the measure in question."

ERRATA.—VOL. II.

P. 44, l. 22—for *under the*—read, *upon their*.
Note P. 234, l. 4—for 1802—read, 1832.