

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_218674

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 919.44
W14L Accession No. G15'632
Author WAKEFIELD, Edward Gibbon
Title Letter from Sydney & other
writings. A23

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

Everyman, I will go with thee, and be thy guide,
In thy most need to go by thy side.

This is No. 828 of Everyman's Library. A list of authors and their works in this series will be found at the end of this volume. The publishers will be pleased to send freely to all applicants a separate, annotated list of the Library.

J. M. DENT & SONS LIMITED
10-13 BEDFORD STREET LONDON W.C.2

E. P. DUTTON & CO. INC.
286-302 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY
EDITED BY ERNEST RHYS

TRAVEL

A LETTER FROM SYDNEY
AND OTHER WRITINGS
BY EDWARD GIBBON WAKE-
FIELD • INTRODUCTION BY
PROFESSOR R. C. MILLS

EDWARD GIBBON WAKEFIELD, born in 1796. Employed at the embassy at Turin, 1814-16, and attached to the embassy at Paris, 1820-6. Imprisoned, 1826-9. Emigrated to Wellington, New Zealand, 1853, and died in 1862.

A LETTER FROM SYDNEY
AND OTHER WRITINGS



EDWARD GIBBON WAKEFIELD

LONDON: J. M. DENT & SONS LTD.
NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO. INC.

All rights reserved
Made in Great Britain
at The Temple Press Letchworth
and decorated by Eric Ravilious

J. M. Bent & Sons Ltd.
Aldine House Bedford St. London
First Published in this Edition 1929

INTRODUCTION

ON Friday, 21 August, 1829, the *Morning Chronicle*, then a leading London daily newspaper, published a letter from Sydney written by an anonymous correspondent. It was followed, during the next six weeks, by ten further letters from the same pen. Before the end of the year these letters, together with an Appendix, were published in book form by Joseph Cross, Simpkin and Marshall, and Effingham Wilson in a slim duodecimo volume entitled *A Letter from Sydney, the Principal Town of Australasia*. The book bore no author's name, but was described as "edited by Robert Gouger," who later became one of the founders of South Australia. Its publication caused a mild sensation in the literary and political world of London, and the book quickly ran to a second edition. The anonymous author set out in a lively and entertaining fashion his experiences as a settler on twenty thousand acres of land in New South Wales, where he had hoped to live like a gentleman on his estate, but had been profoundly disappointed. Incidentally he analysed the causes of his failure, found them deep-rooted in the circumstances of the colony, and propounded a system of colonization intended to make New South Wales happy and prosperous.

In those days the voyage to Sydney took three or four months, so that the book did not arrive in Australia until 1830. The press of the two older colonies, New South Wales and Tasmania (then Van Diemen's Land), published long extracts from the book, and indulged in many speculations as to the anonymous author. The *Morning Chronicle* had admitted that the letters were actually written in London as a setting for a new plan of colonization, but the secret of authorship was so well kept that only internal evidence could show whether or not the writer was a colonist. Despite some division of opinion, the general view of the Australian press was that the author, if not a "penny-a-liner from Grub Street," anxious "to fill a chasm in the *Chronicle* and another in his own stomach," had not only written the book "within sound of Bow Bells/' but had never seen the Australian colonies. Opinion was more evenly divided as to the accuracy of the

picture he had drawn of colonial life. One editor thought that on this subject the book "contained more real and more accurate information than any other which has ever yet been given to the public." Another, however, called it a "mere tissue of nonsense." The general view was that the author had told not a little truth, mingled with fiction and distorted by caricature, so that the colonial press was "equipoised between commendation and blame." Then, and even later, when the author's name had been divulged, many believed that the book was the work of a colonist. Actually it was the work of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, who never saw the Australian colonies, and who was at the time of writing serving in Newgate a well-merited sentence of three years' imprisonment for the crime of abduction. Wakefield was born in 1796, so that at the time of his trial he was thirty years of age. He came of a Quaker family in which there was a long tradition of public service and practical philanthropy. But from early youth his conduct had caused his relations and friends much misgiving. At more than one school he had proved a difficult pupil, and, when his schooldays were over, "spoiled for business and unqualified for a profession/" he had drifted aimlessly into minor diplomatic work on the Continent, where he lived the life of a man of fashion. His trial revealed a sordid story of deception practised upon Ellen Turner, a schoolgirl heiress, whom he had deceived into a runaway marriage at Gretna Green. It gave to the name of Edward Gibbon Wakefield an unenviable notoriety, which would have effectually crushed a lesser man. But rarely has punishment had a more salutary effect upon a man's character. His crime appeared the inevitable end of a wasted life, but actually it was the starting-point of a new and a noble career. His real nature had been obscured by his follies; his imprisonment cut away the excrescences and revealed the sterling qualities which lay beneath. For Wakefield's bent of mind was philanthropic, not criminal, and he deliberately set himself to the task of rehabilitating his name by devoting his life to improving the well-being of his fellow-men. He selected colonization as his field—Newgate and New South Wales were then in some respects not unlike—and he used his time in prison to fit himself for the part of colonial reformer, which he played well and consistently to the end of his life. Less than two years sufficed for him to read and master all that had been written on Australia, and he used his knowledge

and his imagination to good purpose. The stigma of Newgate clung to Wakefield for the greater part of his life, so that he was practically debarred from the public career for which he was pre-eminently fitted, and had to work, as he himself put it, "like the mole, in out-of-sight obscurity." For this reason, he was wise to suppress for a time the fact of his authorship of the *Letter from Sydney*. He published under his own name, in 1831, a book called *The Punishment of Death*, a powerful and moving appeal against the frequency of this penalty, based upon his experience in Newgate. But whilst he could claim some authority to write on this subject, he could in 1829 claim none on colonization, and his name on the *Letter from Sydney* would merely have moved readers to repulsion or ridicule.

The object of the *Letter from Sydney* was to clothe in an attractive form a serious attempt to analyse the economic, social, and political conditions of New South Wales, and to make suggestions for improvement. In this object Wakefield was peculiarly successful, for the analysis was clear, the remedies appropriate, and the method of presentation entertaining.

Economically the colony's prosperity suffered, he argued, from scarcity of labour due to the fact that no one would willingly work for hire as an agricultural labourer while he could so easily obtain a free grant of land. Nor could the temptation of free land be withstood by the emigrant whose passage had been paid on condition of his accepting employment. The only real labour-supply was afforded by convicts, and was neither plentiful nor satisfactory. None the less, it was the foundation of the prosperity of New South Wales, because purchases by the Government for the purpose of maintaining and protecting the penal establishments furnished the chief demand for the products of the colony.

Socially the colonists were "new" people, who "make no progress in the art of living; who, in respect of wealth, knowledge, skill, taste, and whatever belongs to civilization, have degenerated from their ancestors" (p. 68). The constant influx of criminals meant insecurity to life and property, a blunting of the moral sense of the people, corrupt language, general drunkenness, and, above all, a disproportion between the sexes which was conducive neither to public nor to private morality.

Politically the colony was governed by men who were

INTRODUCTION

foreigners except in name, mere temporary residents who, dealing with a population in the main criminal, acquired "the sentiments and manners of jailers and turnkeys" (p. 31). Opposed to the Government were the wealthier emancipated convicts, and others who demanded self-government and even independence of Britain. This difference of opinion allowed of no compromise, so that bitter and continual war was waged between the parties.

Wakefield's system of colonization propounded in this book attempts to attack all these problems. Land, instead of being given away, was, he urged, to be sold at a "sufficient price," that is, one high enough to prevent a labourer from becoming a landowner too quickly. This measure would provide the capitalist with labour by encouraging landowners to pay the passages of emigrants, who would be forced to labour for hire until they had saved enough money to purchase land for themselves. The proceeds from the sale of lands were to be spent in paying the passages of selected young married couples. These two measures together, he considered, would also go far towards curing social evils. Free emigrants would leaven the mass of the colonists, the moral tone of the colony would improve, other classes than labourers would be induced to emigrate, and the colonies would no longer be "new," but "extensions of older societies." Finally, such a people would be well qualified to govern themselves, and should be entrusted with the task. Then the colony, economically prosperous, socially regenerated, and politically free, would cease to wish for independence, and "Britain would become the centre of the most extensive, the most civilized, and, above all, the happiest empire in the world" (p. 90).

The chief defect of the book is a certain lack of unity; but the plan of desultory notes on connected topics apparently suited Wakefield's genius, for he regularly employs it in all his most important writings. The *Letter from Sydney* reveals in Wakefield a powerful imagination which enabled him to place himself in the position of the colonists, and to describe vividly things he had not seen; a concrete habit of thinking which allowed him to treat of real people instead of abstract "colonies" and "populations"; and an unusually happy gift of expression which marks the book off from many works on colonization written before and since. The colonial press with one accord praised his bright touch and his easy style. He is "an amusing sort of proser," his style is "piquant, half

serious, half comic," and his language "pure and elegant." Wakefield might not have been flattered by praise of this kind from the press of a colony where, he said, instead of pure English, "the base language of English thieves is becoming the established language." A better judge is his biographer, Dr. Garnett, who describes the *Letter from Sydney* as "a work memorable in the catalogue of books composed in prison, even though their roll includes the *Consolation* of Boethius, Grotius' *De Veritate*, Raleigh's *History of the World*, and, above all, *Pilgrim's Progress*." Of the style he writes, "always racy, often eloquent, its argumentative cogency is continually irradiated by flashes of humour." Finally, he cites the description of the Genoese girl as "a little idyll worthy of Goethe, . . . establishing once for all the rank which Wakefield might have attained in pure literature if his mind had not been so completely engrossed by the practical side of life." But the practical side of life remained Wakefield's chief concern. Not content with announcing to the world a new system of colonization, he devoted the whole of his extraordinary talents and energy to the task of putting his plan into practice.

Of the three principles—land-sales, selected immigration, and self-government—which are the chief factors of the Wakefield theory, or "systematic colonization," as he and his followers preferred to call it, not one was new; Wakefield's claim to originality rests upon the fact that he combined them into a unified theory and impressed them with the stamp of his powerful mind. Experiments with land and emigration had often been suggested for colonies. A scheme of this kind had been proposed by the anonymous writer of letters to Peel in Wentworth's book, *British Settlements in Australasia*. Wakefield's chief debt was to an obscure Scotch-Canadian writer, Robert Gourlay, but it is safe to say that, however close the resemblance between the two plans, Gourlay's would have been completely forgotten but for Wakefield's success. He and his followers claimed for the theory a scientific accuracy and precision which it never had. Its great merit was that it contained a series of useful practical rules for conducting colonisation in an orderly way, which should neither be the "shovelling out of paupers," nor the "shameful and unblessed" method of transportation of convicts. From 1829 until his death in 1862 Wakefield busied himself with the task of regenerating colonies and colonial policy. An unrivalled

propagandist, and an astute manager of men, he obtained the support first of a small but able and enthusiastic body of followers, then of a larger circle of influential public men, until finally nearly all discussion of problems of colonization was conducted in terms of the Wakefield theory, and even Government dispatches spoke his language. As Professor Graham Wallas remarks, "there are few political inventors to whom historians would ascribe so large a measure of political success." Under his influence a revolution was wrought in Australia when waste land was sold and part of the proceeds devoted to paying the passages of free, selected emigrants. This policy set in flow a tide of free emigration which swamped the convict element even before gold transformed the face of Australia and the character of its population. The two colonies of South Australia and New Zealand owe their existence as British colonies to his inspiration. In a wider field his ideas of colonial self-government, enshrined in the Durham Report and accepted alike by mother-country and colonies, made possible the growth in its present form of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

With a record such as this, Wakefield well deserves to be remembered as one of the master-builders of Greater Britain, and the republication, after a hundred years, of his first and most attractive work on colonization may serve to recall to the present generation the value of his services to the Empire.

1928.

R. C. MILLS.

To illustrate the development of the ideas propounded in the *Letter from Sydney* there are appended two extracts from Wakefield's later writings. In 1833 he concluded a discussion of the social and political differences between Britain and the United States (*England and America*) with a chapter on "The Art of Colonization" which restated his views more elaborately and with such modifications and illustrations as the criticisms of English friends and the recent history of the Australian colonies (as far as he knew it, which was not always accurately) seemed to afford him. The extract made from this chapter (*England and America*, vol. ii, pp. 72-262) is continuous, except for the omission of some long footnotes of merely ephemeral interest, and represents the Wakefield who founded the South Australian Company; its statements, however, as has already been hinted, must not be taken as accurate information about events in New South Wales.

The second extract gives us a much later Wakefield, after much experience in Canada and (vicariously) in New Zealand

had taught him the practical difficulties of oversea colonization. In 1849, reverting to his old love of the epistolary form, he published *A View of the Art of Colonization, in Letters between a Statesman and a Colonist*. This book is, as might be anticipated, an *omnium gatherum* of politics and philosophy and colonial history (usually biased), and does not on the whole afford, a sound basis for practical constructive work; but it is infused with an ironic humour, as often as not directed against the author himself, which makes extremely interesting reading—although the statesman "complains of a patriotic headache" as early as the fifteenth of the seventy letters. A notable character in it is "Mr. Mothercountry"—originally a creation of Charles Buller's to typify the attitude of the permanent Colonial Office official of those days towards the settlements he administered—borrowed, and almost specifically indicated, by Wakefield as a pseudonym for Sir James Stephen, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies from 1834 to 1847. From this book, to avoid the introduction of irrelevancies and wider issues, has been taken only an extract embodying Wakefield's last words on his land-sales policy—the "sufficient price" and selected migration, and stating with as much impartiality as can be expected the objections made to it over a long series of years of practical experience.

LIFE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Born 20 March, 1796. Admitted to Westminster School, January 1809. Refused to return to school in September, and was removed to Edinburgh High School. Left there January 1812. Employed by William Hill, Envoy to Count of Turin, 1814. Made run-away match with Eliza Susan Pattle. Returned to Turin as secretary to Under-Secretary of the Legation and after his wife's death in January 1820 became connected with Paris legation. Abducted from school Ellen Turner. Overtaken at Calais by her relatives and is arrested on return to England with his brother William, and sentenced to three years imprisonment, 1826. "A Letter from Sidney," published under name of Robert Yonger, 1829. National Colonization Society founded, 1830. "Swing Unmasked," "Facts Relating to the Punishment of Death in the Metropolis," 1831. "The Hangman and the Judge," "England and America," 1833. Founded South Australian Association, 1834. Edited Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," 1835-9. Formed New Zealand Association; "Popular Politics," 1837. Accompanied Lord Durham (Governor of British Colonies in North America) to Canada as unofficial adviser, 1838. New Zealand Land Co. formed, 1839. Controlling New Zealand Land Co., 1841. Returns to Canada, 1841 and 1843. Takes part in Canadian politics as Member of Parliament and secret adviser to Sir Charles Metcalfe. "A View of Sir Charles Metcalfe's Government of Canada," 1844. Struck down with paralysis of the brain, 1846. Resigns his directorship of New Zealand Co., and founds Church of England Settlement at Canterbury with Lord Lyttelton and John Godley; "A View of the Art of Colonization," 1849. Founded Colonial Reform Society with Charles Adderley. Left for New Zealand, lands at Port Lyttelton, 1853. Becomes adviser to acting Governor, Col. Wynyard. Complete breakdown, 1854. Died at Wellington, 16 May, 1862.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	vii
PREFACE	3
A LETTER FROM SYDNEY—	
Value of Land, Timber, and Minerals	6
Settling	9
Plans o f Immigration	14
Free Emigrants	21
Society	24
Ruling Idea o f the Colony	27
Colonial Ladies	28
Politics	30
Influence o f Convict Labour	35
Wool Question	39
Van Diemen's Land	44
Influence of Transportation on Colonial Manners and Habits	47
Position o f Australasia	54
Capacity of Australasia for Supporting a Dense Population	57
"Currency Lasses"	61
A New People	68
Cure and Preventative o f Newness	77
Restriction	77
Free Migration	79
Anticipation	80
Extension o f Britain	82
Convicts	87
Conclusion	91
POSTSCRIPT	92
APPENDIX. OUTLINE OF A SYSTEM OF COLONIZATION	100
THE ART OF COLONIZATION—	
Nature and Limits of the Subject	109

THE ART OF COLONIZATION (<i>continued</i>)—	PAGE
The Ends of Colonization as respects the Mother Country	110
I. The Extension of Markets	113
II. Relief from Excessive Numbers	118
III. Enlargement of the Field for Employing Capital	124
The Ends of Colonization, as respects the Colony .	125
The Means of Colonization	130
I. The Disposal of Waste Land	132
II. The Removal of People	161
Co-operation of the Mother Country	178
The Foundation of Colonies	188
The Government of Colonies	191
THE SUFFICIENT PRICE	203
INDEX	255

A LETTER FROM SYDNEY
THE PRINCIPAL TOWN OF
AUSTRALASIA

PREFACE

"ANOTHER evil, aggravated, though certainly not engendered, by the miserable administration of our poor-laws, is our present redundancy of population. He must have been inattentive to what is visible in almost every town and hamlet throughout the kingdom, who does not perceive that population has, for at least fifteen or twenty years, been increasing at a rate for which no improvement in agriculture or manufactures could afford employment. For many years it failed to attract the attention it deserved, but is now brought practically home to all orders of society. By what means this severe, and apparently sudden calamity, is come upon us, is well worthy of inquiry. The same excess of numbers which caused the hardy tribes of the north, in former times, to pour their swarms over the south, is again experienced in every part of Europe, but presses most heavily of all on England. Instead of parents delighting in the spread of their families, and rejoicing in the display of their endowments of mind and body as they grow up, they no sooner open their eyes on the world, than in comes solicitude about the means of rearing them; and when they approach maturity, a degree of anxiety, unknown and unnecessary in former times, is frequently experienced, as to procuring for them situations wherein, by skill and diligence, they may earn an honourable support. *All trades, pursuits, and professions are becoming more and more overstocked; and multitudes of persons, of all degrees and ages, are moving about, without employment, useless to themselves, and a burden to the public.* It is possible that this excessive increase of population (which forms the subject of several able treatises lately published in France, and of a most elaborate work which we have just received from Germany) may at last correct itself; but it will not do so for a considerable time, nor until great privations have been suffered; and ours are likely to be the most serious and prolonged, as this is the country where the multiplication of the people has been going on with by far the greatest rapidity. In this strait, the quantity of land suffered to lie uncultivated and waste, in this island and in Ireland, appears to us most extraordinary; and, not less so,

the small degree of public attention attracted to our colonies, which exceed in number and value those which any state in the world ever before possessed. Hitherto, we have derived from them little assistance, because the poor are sure of being maintained by their parishes at home, and the rich have been brought up too indulgently to sit down willingly as settlers in a new country. Necessity, however, will overcome all repugnance. *No pains should be spared to teach the labouring classes to regard the colonies as the land of promise, which it should be their highest ambition to be able to reach. Nor does this matter concern the poorer orders among us alone: in the colonies, a large proportion of the children or grandchildren of the highest families in this land must be contented to fix their abode, unless they resolve to drag on a life of dependence and indigence here. It is unfortunate that these establishments should so long have been regarded as fit only for the residence of convicts, labourers, mechanics, and desperate or needy men.* THE GREEK COLONIES CONTAINED A MIXTURE OF ALL CLASSES OF SOCIETY. Regularity and subordination were thus encouraged and preserved in all stages of their progress, and they rose to wealth and eminence much earlier than they would otherwise have done. We ought still to follow their example, though it is vain to expect that all the colonies we have will prove so effectual a drain as we now require. *Hitherto, at least, our population has been increasing at the rate of between 3 and 400,000 annually, while those removed to our colonies, including convicts and emigrants, have not exceeded the rate of 7 or 8,000 at the utmost. We may, however, expect the ratio of emigration to rise considerably above this, and we ought to use all our efforts with that view. If adequate encouragement be held out to enterprising young men of rank and connections; if young men and women, in the intermediate ranks of life, are accustomed to look to the colonies as the most certain means of obtaining a comfortable settlement; and if the poor could be persuaded that it would be better for them to purchase a passage, by binding themselves to serve as bondsmen a few years after their arrival in the colonies, than to wear out an abject and hopeless life at home, the country might be materially relieved of the useless population by which it is likely soon to be encumbered. The policy of emigration, we once more say, ought, in these days, to go hand in hand with that of agricultural improvement at home."*

Quarterly Review, No. Ixxviii, Art. 8. On the
State and Prospects of the Country.

A LETTER FROM SYDNEY

As the Australasian settlements are known indifferently by several names, I must introduce the following account of their condition and prospects, by requesting you to understand that, by Australia, I mean the large island of which one half is called New Holland, and the other New South Wales; and that, by Australasia, I mean Australia and all the smaller islands in its neighbourhood, including Van Diemen's Land.

In the first place, I have to give you, in general terms, my opinion of Eastern Australia, and of the prospects which this penal settlement offers to emigrants of a class above "convicts, labourers, mechanics, and desperate or needy men."

All that you read in the works of Wentworth and Cunningham, as to the healthfulness and beauty of the climate, is strictly true. There are scarcely any diseases but what result immediately from intemperance. Dropsy, palsy, and the whole train of nervous complaints, are common enough; but then, drunkenness is the vice *par excellence* of the lower orders; and the better class of settlers have not learned those habits of temperance which are suited to the climate of Naples. The two classes often remind me of English Squires and their grooms, as I used to see them at Florence, just after the peace; the masters drinking at dinner, because they were abroad, and after dinner because they were Englishmen; the servants drinking always, because wine and brandy were cheap. Perhaps a generation must pass away before the people here will accommodate their habits to the climate, which is that of Italy, without either malaria or the sirocco. I shall have more to say on this head presently.

The soil of New South Wales is not particularly fertile. The plains of the Ganges, and of the great rivers of China, the lowlands of the West India islands, the swamps of the Gulf of Mexico, and even the marshes of Essex, produce crops of which the people here have no conception; but then, as we are without

great masses of alluvial deposit, so are agues and intermittent fevers absolutely unknown. In point of natural fertility, I am inclined to compare this soil to that of France; and I have no doubt that, if the same quantity of agricultural labour as is employed in France, were here bestowed upon an area equal to the French territory, the quantity of produce would fully equal that of France. But hundreds of years must elapse before land, here, will be cultivated as well as in the most barbarous countries of Europe. Having regard, however, only to the natural powers of the soil, this account will probably satisfy you. Timber, coal, iron, and other useful minerals, abound; the harbours and rivers teem with fish; cattle of all sorts thrive and multiply with astonishing rapidity; every fruit that flourishes in Spain and Italy comes to the highest perfection; and Nature fully performs her part in bestowing upon man the necessities, comforts, and luxuries of life.

In the above sketch, I have described my own impressions of the country before I reached it. They remain unaltered by some years of close observation; and I can soberly declare that I believe this country to possess merits of a physical nature superior to those of most other spots on the globe.

VALUE OF LAND, TIMBER, AND MINERALS

I cannot say that in other respects, not physical, I had been misled. I drew my information from books, and the verbal reports of sincere men who had passed many years in the colony. If you wish to form opinions of your own from facts only, study the unpretending but very useful little books of Mr. Curr, Mr. Widdowson, and Mr. Atkinson. Beware, however, of taking for granted their statements of cause and effect. But perhaps you have resolved to come here at all events; in which case you had better examine only the more gaudy pictures of these settlements; and, pursuing the usual course of self-delusion, enjoy, during your passage at least, the comforts of anticipation. The facts on which my opinions were formed have turned out to be true; but my conclusions were miserably erroneous. For example, I was told that an estate of 10,000 acres might be obtained for a mere trifle. This was true. I have got 20,000 acres, and they did not cost me more than 25. per acre. But I imagined that a domain of that extent would be very valuable. In this I was

wholly mistaken. As my estate cost me next to nothing, so it is worth next to nothing. For reasons which I shall mention presently, I tried to sell it; but I could not find a purchaser, without submitting to lose great part of what I had expended in improvements. Yet there are persons continually reaching the colony on purpose to invest money in the purchase of land; but when I have made overtures to them, they have grumbled at my price, saying that they could obtain a grant from the Crown for less than six-pence per acre; and when I have talked of my "improvements/" they have answered that they preferred improving, themselves, to buying *my* improvements. In short, my domain has no market value. It is a noble property to look at; and "20,000 acres in a ring fence," sounds very well in England; but here, such a property possesses no exchangeable value. The reason is plain: there are millions upon millions of acres, as fertile as mine, to be had for nothing; and, what is more, there are not people to take them. Of my 20,000 acres I reckon about 5000 to be woodland, though, indeed, there are trees scattered over the whole property, as in an English park. For my amusement, I had a rough estimate made of the money that I could obtain for all this timber, were it growing in any part of England. The valuation amounts to above £150,000. Now for my pecuniary advantage, the best thing that could happen to me would be the annihilation of all this natural produce; provided, I mean, that it could be destroyed without cost. The cost of destroying it, out of hand, would be at least £15,000. Thus, in point of fact, my timber injures my estate to that amount, instead of being worth ten times that sum. It seems droll, does it not, that an English hundred-and-fifty-thousand-pounds-worth of any thing should, any where, be a dead loss of fifteen thousand pounds? It is true, however; as you may fully convince yourself by reading, in any of the accounts of these settlements, a chapter upon "Grubbing." Fortunately some other things that I possess, and which, if I had them in England would make me a peter, are not, like the timber, a positive injury. These are mines of coal and iron, in which my estate is supposed to abound. Being under the surface, they can do me no harm; and I shall take good care that they are not disturbed. For if anyone, out of enmity to me, should bring an army of miners from Staffordshire, and raise to the surface a large quantity of my coal and iron ore, the cost of throwing it down the shafts again would quite ruin me, if, indeed, I could, at any cost, find labourers

for the purpose. As for disposing of it in any other way, that would be impossible, for want of roads. Besides, neither the Crown nor individuals would let me injure their land by casting my rubbish on to it. As regards the coal, though, I am mistaken; I might consume it by fire without much trouble. But what could I do with the iron ore, when, even though there should be means to convey it to Sydney, nobody would give me one Birmingham frying-pan for the whole of it? An estate of 20,000 acres, containing rich mines of coal and iron, and covered with magnificent timber, is, no doubt, a very good thing in some countries; but here you will lose money by such a possession; if, that is, you have any money to lose, and unless you take particular care of it.

I did not, you know, intend to become a farmer. Having fortune enough for all my wants, I proposed to get a large domain, to build a good house, to keep enough land in my own hands for pleasure-grounds, park, and game preserves; and to let the rest, after erecting farm-houses in the most suitable spots. My mansion, park, preserves, and tenants, were all a mere dream. I have not one of them. When, upon my first arrival, I talked of these things to some sensible men, to whom I was recommended, they laughed in my face. I soon found that a house would, though the stone and timber were to be had for nothing, cost three times as much as in England. This was on account of the very high wages required by mechanics; but this was not all. None of the materials of a house, except stone and timber, are produced in the colony. Every pane of glass, every nail, every grain of paint, and every piece of furniture, from the kitchen copper to the drawing-room curtains, must have come from England. My property is at a distance of nearly seventy miles from the sea, and there is no road, but a track through the forest, for two-thirds of that distance. Everything, even the food of the labourers, must have been transported from afar. Log-houses must have been built for the labourers; and the cheapest way of providing for them would have been by the establishment of a farm, in the first instance, to produce enough for their subsistence. Lastly, though none of these obstacles had existed, the whole colony did not contain as many masons, carpenters, glaziers, painters, black and whitesmiths, and other mechanics, as I should have required. You may believe most statements of fact respecting the colony; but beware how you draw conclusions!

Of course, I soon abandoned all thought of building a mansion.

As for a park, my whole property was a park, and a preserve for kangaroos and emus. The grand object was to dispark it as soon as possible. I clung for some time to the hope of having tenants; but you will readily see that what deterred me from building a mansion presented numerous obstacles to the erection of farm-houses. Besides, even though I had forced circumstances, and had, at an enormous cost, placed a dozen good homesteads on my land, where was I to find tenants? There is no such class as a tenantry in this country, where every man, who has capital to cultivate a farm, can obtain one of his own for nothing. I soon found that what little my twenty thousand acres had cost me would be entirely lost, unless I turned farmer myself, and endeavoured, by my own exertions, with the assistance of convict servants, to extract something from the soil. Believe statements of fact—but beware how you draw conclusions!

SETTLING

I bore my disappointment as well as could be expected; and, to use a colonial phrase, "took boldly to the bush." I dare say you fancy that it was very agreeable, but I assure you that it was not. The novelty of the thing pleased me at first; but I soon tired of the clear Italian sky, the noble forests, and the sublime solitude of the untrodden wilderness. People in a highly civilized country, like England, are not aware of their own wants. The wants exist, but most of them are supplied as soon as they are formed. In England, when you want to eat, you eat, and there is an end of the want; when you are sleepy, you go to bed; when your clothes are wet, you change them; when you are tired of talking, you take a book; and when you are tired of reading, you begin to talk. But, in the desert, almost every want is severely felt before it is supplied. Everything, from the very beginning, has either to be created or brought from a great distance. Try to reckon the number of your physical wants, which are every day supplied without any effort on your part, and you may form some idea of the physical deprivations of a settler. As for mental wants, talking and reading are out of the question, except it be to scold your servants, and to con over a Sydney newspaper, which contains little else but the miserable party politics of this speck upon the globe, reports of crime and punishment, and low-lived slang and flash, such as fill the pot-house Sunday papers of London.

However, the settler's attention is pretty well diverted from his wants, physical and mental, by the necessity of watching over his property. I bought herds and flocks, horses, ploughs, carts, carpenters' tools, and all sorts of implements of husbandry. My only servants were convicts. My own man, who had served me for eight years in England, and had often sworn that he would go the wide world over with me, seeing that I was the best of masters, never reached my new abode. He had saved about £150 in my service; and I had advised him to take the money out of a London Savings' Bank, under an idea that he might obtain ten per cent, for it at Sydney. He followed my advice. About a month after our arrival I missed him one morning. Before night I received a letter, by which he informed me that he had taken a grant of land near Hunter's River, and that he "hoped we parted friends." He is now one of the most consequential persons in the Colony, has grown enormously fat, feeds upon greasy dainties, drinks oceans of bottled porter and port wine, damns the Governor, and swears by all his gods, Jupiter, Jingo, and Old Harry, that this Colony must soon be independent.

But to return to my convicts. One of them was a London pickpocket, and a more mischievous animal I never had to contend with. The others were country bumpkins, transported for poaching, whom I had obtained with much trouble, supposing that they would serve my turn much better than Londoners; but if they were better able to work than the cockney, they were not a bit more willing. Perhaps he corrupted them; but, be this as it may, they altogether led me the life of a dog. My sheep and cows were continually lost, and it was nobody's fault; my effects were often stolen, though most of them could be of no use to the thieves. I grumbled and threatened; but these men, all round, declared their innocence, and called Heaven to witness that they had not wronged me of a "dump." I stopped some of their extra allowance until the goods should be produced. No more work was done; one was ill—another had hurt his hand—a third "would see me damned first"—and there was I, planted, as the French say, at the distance of twelve miles from any sort of assistance. It seemed necessary, however, to quell this rebellion. I rode, therefore, to the magistrate, got a constable, and sent the whole gang to prison; but the next day I was but too glad to fetch them back; for harvest had just begun, and my maize would have rotted on the ground, had I been long deprived of their labour, such as

it was. I might have had them flogged, or, in colonial Ian" guage, had "their backs scarified," whereby I should have punished them without losing their labour. This is the ordinary, because the most economical, mode of correcting our slaves; but, thanks to Fortune, I was not compelled to adopt it, being rich enough to indulge some foolish sentiments of tenderness and respect for all my fellow-creatures, not to mention tenderness and respect for myself. A necessary consequence, however, of this my abstract humanity and selfish pride, was, that I became the slave of my slaves. Can you imagine a more hateful existence? Meanwhile, I had built a house—so called here, but, properly speaking, a shed. It is well I have abstained from marriage. What should I have done for a delicate woman, bound to me by sacred ties? And if I had had children, and those children had happened to be daughters? Why, I should have done like others, who carry women and children out of civilized society to inhabit the wilderness. I should have made my tender wife a drudge, and my children little savages. Could 20,000 acres of valueless desert have compensated for such misery?

Perhaps you think this a too highly coloured picture of my mishaps?—but remember, I was not bred to labour—I know nothing of farming—I have not been used to the cabin of a brig-of-war, or the mess of a marching regiment. You, too, have enjoyed the leisure which fortune bestows, and have acquired the habits of refinement which belong to a numerous class in England. Were you a broken farmer, or a poor lieutenant, I should say, "Come here by all means. You cannot be placed more unhappily than at present, and you may gain by the change." But I am advising a man of independent fortune, who prefers his library, even to the beauties of nature, and to whom intellectual society is necessary for his peace of mind. Intellectual society! I shall come to that presently.

Disgusted with my convict servants, I sent to England for shepherds, ploughmen, carpenters, a blacksmith, a bricklayer, and other useful labourers. The men arrived in high spirits, having been hired from a part of the country where I was well known, and having, most of them, worked for me in England. They knew that they could depend on the high wages that my English agent had promised them; their passage had been paid for by me; and the sailors had told them that in New South Wales they would live like fighting cocks. Being in the desert when I received notice of their arrival, I hastened to Sydney,

having first got rid of my convicts, for fear that they should contaminate the new-comers. The latter, who, my Sydney agent informed me, had, when they were put ashore, spoken in raptures of the 'Squire, received me with gloomy looks. They were already contaminated, notwithstanding my precaution. One of them, a harness-maker from Salisbury, acted as spokesman for the party, and told me flatly that they had been imposed on. I stared, and asked in what respect?—"They had not been told," he said, "what high wages a man could get in New South Wales—they were told now they could not live on the wages which had been promised them, and they hoped I should take their case into my consideration." I had not bound them by indentures, for I was weak enough to think that free agents would prove better servants than bondsmen. I desired them to "take into their consideration" the cost of their passage; but in the long discussion that ensued, they carefully avoided that point, and dwelt with dogged pertinacity on the wages which honest men, like them, could obtain at or near Sydney. I was completely in their power. By dint of flattery, appeals to their honour, and promises of comfort, I induced the mere peasants to observe their agreement and follow me to the wilds; but the mechanics were impracticable. They had already engaged with masters at Sydney and Parramatta, at double the high wages that I had promised; and I could make no impression on them. I retired to the woods with my clodhoppers, whom I found very serviceable during a whole year; but at the end of that time they began to grumble and fidget. Other persons had settled in my neighbourhood. Some of these had been convicts, and afterwards emancipated servants. They persuaded my men to become settlers also. In less than two years each of my servants saved wherewith to stock a small farm, and one by one they all left me. At last I was glad to obtain a fresh supply of convicts. Under these circumstances, my estate did not produce largely. My herds and flocks, however, had rapidly multiplied: and in the last year of which I speak, I reaped one hundred and forty acres of corn. This was thought immense doings; but as my free labourers were gone, I had no such prospect for the future; and as for the flocks, their increase in number was not a proportionate increase of property to me. The wool produced something; but the flesh was worth nothing, unless taken to market, and then it would scarcely repay the cost of the journey. Here, there are no drovers or jobbers in cattle to come between

the farmer and the butcher. In short, there is little division of labour, and you may roll in plenty, without possessing anything of exchangeable value. You must do almost everything yourself; and flocks in the wilderness are not worth much more than the wilderness itself, of which you may obtain nearly any quantity for all but nothing. Under an idea that cheese would be easily transported, and would fetch a good price in Sydney, I thought at one time of establishing a dairy. But I ought to have known better. My cows were as wild as hyenas, and almost as wicked. I had no milkmaids, no dairy-women, no churns, no any thing that was wanted for the purpose; and, above all, I wanted industry, skill, economy, and taste, for any such pursuits, or, at least, a drudge of a wife to supply those wants. At length my impatience got the better of a certain stupid vanity that had led me to fancy myself qualified to become a settler. I wrote to my friends at Sydney acknowledging that I was sick of the bush, and that their prophecies of my ill success had been fulfilled to the letter. By their assistance I made over my estate for twenty years, with everything upon it, to a tough Scotch farmer, on condition of receiving one-third of its produce. This third produces me less than 3 per cent interest on what I have expended; but I am, comparatively speaking, a happy man, living upon my English income, in a place where at least books, and men and women, such as they are, are not quite wanting, and where money will supply the more pressing wants of civilized life.

Behold me established at Sydney, in a small house, a poor vamped-up building, more inconvenient, and far more ugly, than you can imagine, for which I pay a rent of £250 a year. For half the money you could get twice as good a house in any English country town. This excessive house rent is caused by the dearth of labour, which enhances the cost of building; for, either the builder will exact a rent proportioned to his outlay, or (if he cannot obtain such a rent) he will not build.

I now associated with the inhabitants of Sydney, hoping, as I had become an idle man, to be of some service to the colony, by directing my attention to public objects. To one I talked of introducing the cultivation of silk; to another, of tobacco; to a third, of sugar; to a fourth, of wine;—and I proposed to form societies for these* several objects. But all my proposals were received with coldness. Those to whom I addressed myself knew, though they could not well say why, that my schemes were exceedingly foolish. Seeing them apparently so

deaf to the calls of self-interest, I endeavoured to find some good reason for their conduct; and my trouble in this respect was not thrown away. I puzzled myself for a long while with questions of soil, and climate, and markets, and duties, and bounties. At length the true light broke upon me. The *scarcity of labourers* was an insuperable bar to any mode of cultivation that requires the employment of many hands! I profess to be but little versed in the laws of political economy; but the fact was self-evident. I could not, though I had been ever so reckless, have embarked my fortune in one of the above-named speculations. Had I done so, I should have been ruined, by the dearness of labour. But I could not do so:—there were not labourers enough for the purpose, at any rate of wages.

PLANS OF IMMIGRATION

I then turned my mind to plans of immigration, with a view, at once, to increase the number of working hands and diminish the wages of labour. Many projects suggested themselves to my mind, and were discussed by some of the most intelligent colonists. But, one by one, we abandoned all as utterly worthless. This will surprise you; but attend to me for a moment. Suppose that we had, by some means or other, brought twenty thousand industrious and skilful Chinese into the colony. For how long would they have remained labourers for hire? Just until they had saved money wherewith to obtain grants of land, when they would have become employers of labour, supposing any to be had. A sudden revolution in their condition would have increased the demand for labour, just in the same proportion that it would have diminished the supply. The servants would have become masters, wanting servants. Nothing is more clear.

Suppose, again, that we had sent to England for five thousand starving peasants, and had bound them to labour for seven years, at a rate of wages which, in England, they would have considered extremely liberal. But this mode of supplying an urgent demand for labour, has been tried over and over again in new countries. Can you tell me of a single case in which it has effected its object? I could tell you of hundreds in which it has failed. Indeed, from the very nature of things, it must fail. An indented emigrant, named John, reaches the land of promise in high spirits, and labours contentedly, for three

shillings a day, till he meets a free labourer named Tom. Tom informs John that he, Tom, gets six shillings a day, and he calls Tom a "sneak" for taking only three. Tom, mind, has a personal interest in corrupting John; because, if indented labourers could be held to their bonds, they would reduce the wages of free labourers. John, however, who is as honest as a poor man can be, and is very grateful for his removal from abject misery in England, resists Tom's first attack, and resolves to work out his agreement, though he should be called a thousand sneaks. But the next time they meet, Tom calls him a "poor dunghill devil." Even this does not move his resolution; but as he is now well fed and full of blood, it makes his heart thump against his ribs. At last Tom calls him a "negur slave," and from that moment he determines to be free as soon as possible. Yet this is a favourable case; as, generally speaking, the indented immigrant declares he has been cheated, and resolves to cheat his master, within twenty-four hours of his landing. John now begins to grumble and neglect his work. He and his master soon come to high words, which are not worth repeating. The master, let us suppose, sends him to jail upon the bond; but Tom visits and comforts him. He perseveres, therefore; and his master loses his labour. Suppose that the master could "scarify his back." Even then, though apparently subdued, he might contrive to do less than three shillings worth of labour per day, in which case the produce of his labour would be a loss; and this without manifestly departing from the bond. He might also—and this is no uncommon case—secretly do more than three shillings worth of injury per day to his master's property. Upon the whole, when once an indented labourer becomes dissatisfied, the sooner his bond is cancelled the better for the master. But what the master loses by the cost of the labourer's passage from England is not the whole loss. The once indented labourer obtains six shillings a day; saves half his earnings; obtains a grant of land; and becomes an employer of labour, and a competitor with his late master in the market of industry. This, of course, raises the price of labour to all. So that a large importation of indented labourers may very soon have an effect directly contrary to its purpose.

Two methods of securing the labour of bondsmen have been suggested. First,—it is proposed that, instead of being paid with money only, they should be paid partly with money and partly with land; the right to the land to depend upon good behaviour during the whole term of service mentioned by the

bond, and to vest, of course, only at the expiration of that term. This precaution, however well it look upon paper, has been found, in practice, quite ineffectual; because, wherever land can be obtained for nothing, labour is much more valuable than land;—because John, by saving only two shillings a day for three years, might obtain as much land as he could possibly want. Secondly,—it has been proposed, with a view to remedy the defect of the former suggestion, and, generally, in order to prevent indented labourers from raising the price of labour by becoming employers of industry, that government should not make grants of land to persons of that description. But this device is no better than the other, because John could obtain a grant of land in Tom's name, to which fraud upon the government Tom would be happy to lend himself for nothing; or, in the worst case for John, he might buy some of Tom's, or of any other body's land for a mere trifle. My late menial has recommended that indented labourers should be bound for life, liable to have their "backs scarified," and forbidden by law either to own or hire land, or to work for any but the man who had imported them. This plan would be effectual, no doubt; and we may, perhaps, adopt it. But many people would prefer *negro* slavery, as being, though far more unjust, and therefore more cruel, nevertheless, much better calculated to please the English nation, which does not approve of white slavery. Thus you will perceive that, even though the Poor rates of England were employed in sending labourers to this country, instead of maintaining them in idleness at home, the colonial rate of wages would not be permanently diminished. As before, there would exist an urgent want of labourers; and the only difference would be the spread of that want to places where it does not at present exist. The sole reason why it does not now exist in those places is, because none of the land, there, is yet appropriated. In time, the same intense want of labourers, extended over an immense space, would bring this country to the condition of North America, where, though the population be now eleven millions, the want of labourers is as urgent as ever, and is not altered in character by the increase of people, except that, instead of being confined to a strip of land on the coast, it is extended over half a continent. At the first blush, one would suppose that a want of labour, being in fact a scarcity of people, would be supplied by a supply of people; and this, of course, would be the case in a country where all the land was appropriated. But in an extensive country, of which by

far the greater part is still open to be appropriated by all who can muster capital for cultivating a grant, an increase of people has no permanent effect in supplying the want of labourers. On the contrary, if the immigrants should be capitalists they would render the want of labourers still more urgent; and this may account for the jealousy, and dislike, almost, with which newly arrived settlers in this colony are regarded by those who preceded them. In many of the books that treat of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, you will find this jealousy frequently mentioned. The writers in question attribute it to a fear, on the part of the older settler, that he may be deprived, by a new-comer, of the use of certain unappropriated land in the neighbourhood of his own grant; and this, I believe, is what the older settler imagines to be his motive for falsely assuring the new-comer, that there is no land worth having in his neighbourhood. But were he to reflect for a moment, he would see that, the sooner all the land in his neighbourhood is appropriated and cultivated, the sooner will his own land possess some market value; a circumstance far more profitable to him than the use, for grazing only, of land which, sooner or later, must be appropriated by others. He would acknowledge, therefore, that his real, though latent, motive for wishing to remain isolated in the desert, had been a fear of being surrounded by competitors in the market of labour.

From all these considerations we may infer, that whatever the amount of immigration into a waste country, there must constantly exist an urgent demand for labour, so long as the territory at the disposal of the people shall remain immense in proportion to their numbers—so long, in other words, as there shall remain any fertile land not cultivated. I, for one, used to think quite otherwise. Like thousands who have settled in waste countries, I thought that any actual want for labour might be permanently supplied by a positive increase of people; and this was why I lost so much time, like thousands before me, in forming plans of immigration without reference to territory.

In another respect I fell into what I now believe to be a great error. I imagined that the only evil attendant upon a scarcity of labourers, was an extravagant rate of wages, which, by giving to the labourer a very large share of the produce, prevented the capitalist from accumulating. But I now perceive, that in new countries, a still more fatal check to improvement occurs through an absolute want of labourers at any rate

of wages. To make this clear, I beg of you to remark that there is a *maximum* as well as a *minimum* of wages. No one will work for less than a bare subsistence, and none will employ labourers but for profit. The *minimum*, therefore, being the smallest portion of the produce upon which the labourer can exist, the *maximum* is the largest share which the capitalist can *profitably* relinquish to the labourer. In old countries, the price of labour varies continually, according to the variations in the proportion between capital and labour; but in some old countries the *minimum* is become the ordinary and permanent rate; because, however much capital may have accumulated, no more of it can be profitably employed in providing food for the redundant population. In new countries, on the contrary, the *maximum* is the ordinary and permanent rate; because, however much people may multiply, they are not obliged to sell their labour, and most of them, by saving a small capital and obtaining land, become buyers of labour. This, however, does not comprise the whole difference between old and new countries in respect to the original purchase money of all things. In some old countries, many labourers cannot obtain even the *minimum* of wages, but are either starved or maintained in idleness. In Britain, for example, though we cannot tell how many people die of misery, we know how many millions of money are annually expended in maintaining idle paupers. Whereas, in new countries, capitalists often cannot obtain labourers even at the *maximum*. In America, when the pay of seamen in the navy exceeded the *maximum* of wages in the merchant service, the naval demand, even for landsmen, was still unsupplied. So at this moment in Australasia, there is, notwithstanding the limited supply of cheap labour afforded by convicts, an unsupplied demand for labourers at the *maximum*. Take, for example, the case of settlers in Van Diemen's Land, where as many as 5000 sheep, sometimes, and 2000 commonly, are allowed to run in one flock, male and female, old and young, weak and strong, all mixed together. The loss, in consequence of this bad management, is immense. That loss would be wholly prevented by the employment of more shepherds; and anyone capable of estimating the loss, will acknowledge that its prevention would afford ample wages to the additional shepherds, besides leaving an additional profit to their employer. But though these *maximum* wages are, there, going abegging, as one may say, there are not labourers to take them. The case of the Australian Company furnishes another

example. With a capital of £1,000,000, the company proposes "to produce, at a more distant time, wine, olive oil, hemp, flax, silk, opium, etc." But why not *now*? Not for want either of capital, or of picked land, rent, tithe, and tax free, or of a favourable climate, or of ready markets; not even for want of cheap labour, inasmuch as, under the peculiar circumstances, these commodities might be profitably produced, though wages should be high;—but simply, because, for any such purposes, which require the employment of many hands, there is an absolute want of hands at any rate of wages.

What does all this mean but that there is a constant waste of capital? Great part of the capital of the Australian Company is safely employed in England, at a profit of, perhaps, 3 per cent, per annum; but is not the trampling to death of sheep in Van Diemen's Land a waste of capital? Is not the mere destruction of useful timber a waste of capital? I could fill pages with an account of the number of things, which would be of great value in England, which would be considered as capital in any densely peopled country, but which we throw away as rubbish.

But this state of things is not without many precedents. It has occurred in every waste country, settled by emigrants from civilized countries. In most other new countries, it has been partially remedied by means of slavery; and a time may come when its evils will be mitigated here in the same way. For, seeing that this colony would never be anything but a half-barbarous, Tartarian, ill-cultivated, poverty-stricken wilderness, until, in the course of nature, some hundreds of years hence, the population should become more dense, I began to hanker after, what till then, I had considered the worst of human ills—the institution of slavery. How often, in my presumption, had I cursed the memory of Las Casas, for bribing the first planters of Hispaniola to spare the inhabitants of that island, by suggesting that they might obtain slaves from Africa! How scornfully, in my ignorance of cause and effect, had I abused the Democrats of North America for cherishing the horrors of slavery! In moments of weakness, how I had sighed, and even shed tears of compassion and anger, at the damnable cruelties which I saw inflicted upon Blacks at the Cape of Good Hope! And yet, in spite of my reason and every better feeling of my nature, I brought myself to find excuses for the Spaniards, Americans, and Dutch; aye, even to think that a few thousand Negroes would be a great acquisition to New South Wales! So

they would; and they would conduce to the wealth, and—deny it who will—even to the *civilization* of these colonial land-owners. What made Lord———a rich, well-educated, and agreeable gentleman?—The sweat, and blood, and tears of his and his father's slaves in Jamaica! Had slavery never existed, he would, in the natural course of things, have been a little West Indian farmer, perhaps scarcely able to read—certainly not fit to be a member of civilized society. What made the most able public men of North America? Even their slaves, which conferred upon them riches, leisure, and instruction. Slavery has not produced any distinguished men in South Africa; because slavery, there, is of a gentle kind—domestic, not predial. But the African farmer is highly civilized, when compared with some of the descendants of Spaniards, who inhabit the Pampas of the Rio de la Plata; and he owes whatever distinguishes him from the Tartar to the cheap labour of his slaves. In my heart I abhor the very name of slavery; but this is my adopted country, and when I contemplate its future condition, I can conceive that slavery was revived for something else than the gratification of man's worst propensities. Slavery exists, not to gratify the hearts of cruel men, but to fill the pockets of those who, without slavery, would be poor and insignificant. It will never be abolished by appeals to the hearts of slave-owners. You might as well expect to make Mr. Buxton and Mr. Macaulay live upon vegetables, by showing them the cruelties of Smithfield. It is wonderful, but true, that, notwithstanding the great exertions of the abolitionists, the number of slaves owned by Christians is increasing every day. But why should we wonder? What was the sole cause of the revival of slavery by Christians, but the discovery of waste countries, and the disproportion which has ever since existed in those countries between the demand and supply of labour? And what is it that increases the number of slaves to Christian masters, but the increase of Christian capitalists wanting labourers, by the spreading of Christian people over regions heretofore waste?

I constantly ask myself, whether it be possible to devise any means by which to establish, in a new country, such a proportion between people and land as would render labour plentiful, and not extravagantly dear. Here we have, it is true, a species of slave-labour—that of convicts, and our system of slavery has been peculiarly favourable to the master, because the slaves have been obtained without any prime cost. To this, combined with the demand for produce created by the

great expenditure of Government, the few rich men of New South Wales are wholly indebted for their fortunes. But the supply of cheap labour was always small and variable; and, of late, the demand has so much increased, through the increase of landowners, that not the slightest dependence can be placed on convict labour as a permanent source of wealth. You may obtain, though not without trouble, one, two, or perhaps three, convicts, for a term of a few years; but that they will rob you, is almost certain; that they will murder you, is by no means improbable; and that their labour will not be very profitable, is beyond a doubt. What, then, are we to do, to obtain that desirable proportion between the demand and supply of labour, without which, I say, no country can flourish? Answer me that question satisfactorily, and I will tell you that Botany Bay is an earthly paradise. This, indeed, would be a glorious discovery. Call it an invention, or what you will, it must, whenever established in a country cursed with slavery, cause the natural, slow, easy death of that hideous monster. Fancy the slavery of America and South Africa in a slow consumption, and free labour growing up, healthy, strong, and cheerful, to supply its place! But I am dreaming—We have a right to presume that slavery will flourish in America and South Africa, until there shall be no more land to be obtained for next to nothing; and that the inhabitants of Australasia must, for hundreds of years to come, secretly long for a trade in human flesh. Tell me the time when the disproportion between the demand and supply of labour in America, South Africa, and Australasia will cease, and I will tell you when slavery will cease in America and South Africa, and when the Australasians will become a rich, instructed, refined, and highly civilized people. Meanwhile, I deliberately state it as my opinion, that a permission to obtain slaves from Africa would be most beneficial to these settlements, with a view only to wealth and civilization; and that if Australasia should become independent to-morrow, these people would find some means of establishing slavery in spite of all the saints.

FREE EMIGRANTS

Did I not mention something about intellectual society? There is no such thing in this country; at least, in the sense which you attach to the words. We are not barbarians—the

colony is too young for that. Not even the thieves of England have had time to forget the civilization, such as it was, which they brought from the old country. Our free settlers, whose emigration dates some time after that of the first convicts, are English men and women, not much altered from what they were in England. Some generations hence, their descendants will probably be as uncouth, and ignorant, and violent as the great mass of North Americans. Perhaps, as here there are no dense forests to prevent them from spreading, they may become as wild as the inhabitants of the Pampas, or as gross, lethargic, and stupid as the boors of the Cape of Good Hope; who, by the by, were *compelled* to spread by the Dutch mode of granting land. But, at present, they are English people, to all intents and purposes, of that class to which, in England, they belonged. You will understand, however, that they were not of a class particularly intellectual, even whilst in England; and it was not to be expected that they should cultivate their minds here. They came here for a very different purpose. Literary men, men of science, philosophers, do not emigrate to new countries where their acquirements would be neither rewarded nor admired. Sir Walter Scott, Sir Humphrey Davy, and Mr. Malthus, would not earn as much in this colony as three brawny experienced ploughmen; and though the inordinate vanity of a new people might be gratified by the possession of them, they would be considered as mere ornaments, and would often be wholly neglected, for things of greater utility—unless, indeed, Mr. Malthus could create for us that proportion of which I have spoken above. In that case, we should load him with riches, and erect statues to his honour in every market-place. Apropos of statues—professors of the fine arts would be of no greater value here than writers and philosophers. I can now easily comprehend why Copley and West emigrated from America, and why Cooper and Irving are become citizens of Europe. And I have said enough to explain why this country imports hardly any superior intellect.

Of what class then, you ask, have been the great mass of emigrants from England, not convicts? Excellent people in their way, most of them; farmers, army and navy surgeons, subalterns on half-pay, and a number of indescribable adventurers, from about the twentieth rank in England. They came here to live, not to enjoy; to eat and drink, not to refine; to "settle"—that is, to roll in a gross plenty for the body, but to starve their minds. To these must be added convicts, many

of whom are become rich and influential; and some, not exactly convicts, to whom England ceased to be a convenient residence. The English who live at Boulogne, some for cheapness, some from misfortune, and some from fear, would offer, I should think, a fair sample of the materials which compose the best society in New South Wales; though, I must admit, that the bustling, thriving settler of New South Wales is a companion, rather ignorant though he be—far away preferable to the **not** more enlightened, but melancholy English sluggard of Boulogne. To form a due conception of the "upper classes" here, suppose all the natives of France annihilated, and the whole country belonging to the English residents of Boulogne. In that case, there would be an almost perfect resemblance between those Englishmen who, across a narrow channel, can see their own country, and those who, at its antipodes, look upon the Pacific Ocean. Man—how often must it be repeated?—is the creature of circumstances. In likening these, my fellow colonists, to the English outcasts in France, I speak only of their original composition.

They had nothing to lose, and they have gained immensely by the change in their condition. This is true, both in a pecuniary and in a moral sense. A poor man who emigrates to New South Wales may become comparatively rich; and though he should be ever so idle by habit, he must become industrious, or starve. My case is an exception to the ordinary course of things, here. I did not come to *make* money, but to invest money made by my grandfather. This was a capital error on my part. But to proceed. The poor lieutenant, whose miserable pittance would but just support him in England—whose wife and children were a burthen, and whose life was passing away between the anxieties of poverty and the short day-dreams of brandy and water—becomes, here, independent; wealthy in grain and cattle; a proprietor of thousands of acres; a master of servants, such as they are; an uxorious husband, and a fond father, because his wife and children, instead of being a burthen, are of infinite value to him; and an excellent member of society, such as it is, because he is deeply interested in the well-being of the community. What a contrast with the lazy, pick-tooth, fretful, loungers of the pier at Boulogne!

But this is the bright side. We must not forget the original composition. I will now briefly describe the actual condition of **our** "best society."

SOCIETY

You imagine, perhaps, that society here is divided into but two classes—criminal slaves, and their temporary owners. But let me tell you, this is by no means the case. We have gradations of rank almost as numerous as those which divide the community of England. The Governor is King; and a much more powerful man he is, in respect to those over whom he rules, than the Sovereign of Britain. This will be clear to you, when you reflect that the King of England can govern only by responsible Ministers, and that our King governs without responsibility, except to those who appoint him; who live at the antipodes of his palace, and who, of course, trouble themselves but little about this distant and insignificant settlement. Besides, an Englishman may be at bitter variance with the Ministers, without the slightest injury to his private affairs; however loud his opposition, his name may not even be known to the Government; and, though he should be a thorn in their sides, like Joseph Hume, he may be rich and happy in spite of them. Whereas, in this small community, every man's words are reported and weighed; and the ill will of the Sovereign may deeply affect his fortunes. Here, scarcely anybody lives on a fortune made by his grandfather. It is the local Government which supplies the means of production, and which, again, is the principal purchaser for consumption. Here, convicts are of immense value, and it is the Government which bestows those temporary slaves; here, almost every man is a cultivator of the soil, and the Government is the principal buyer of agricultural produce. Add to this, that the Governor disposes of many offices, some giving rank, and some profit,—and, above all, of waste land, that is, of unappropriated earth, air, and water!

You may perhaps think, that as waste land possesses no value, the power to dispose of it can give no influence. Reflect, however, for a moment. Notwithstanding the experience of ages there are still persons who imagine that an estate of 20,000 acres, bearing noble timber, must, any where, be a very valuable property. Such persons, guided wholly by their imaginations, long for extensive domains even in such a country as this; and he who can gratify or disappoint them, as he pleases, must, for a time, hold them in subjection. Anticipation is universally more pleasant than the fact, and one man having controul over the hopes of mankind would be master of

the world. In the next place, the Government of a new Colony alone determines the sites of towns, and the direction of roads; whereby it has the power to give a considerable market value to certain portions of territory. I am the most independent man in this Colony; but its Governor could at once put twenty or thirty thousand pounds into my pocket by making a road through my estate, and nailing upon one of my trees, a board inscribed with, "This is——Town." How, then, can I help being, at all times, his most devoted humble servant? How, indeed, but by recollecting that I draw a competent income from England, which enables me to enjoy my existence; that in a few years both "His Excellency" and I shall be meat for the worms; and that, consequently, I have not an hour to spare for the misery of being his parasite.

The Governments of all new countries exercise an imperceptible despotism over the affairs of nearly all their subjects, by means of their power over waste land. They can raise or lower the wages of labour by restricting or extending grants of earth, air, and water; and by the same means they can raise or lower the value of land already appropriated by individuals. Capitalists and landowners, therefore, are liable to be ruined, or made rich, by the mere will of the Government. The history of settlements in desert countries abounds with instances of *fluctuations* in the value of land and of labour, arising solely from fluctuations in the proportion between the people and the territory for their subsistence; and such fluctuations have, for the most part, been caused solely by a restriction or an extension to the amount of grants. I do not pretend that the Governments of new countries have ever increased or lessened the amount of grants, with a direct view to raise or lower the value of land and labour: for I believe that they have been, and still are, unconscious of their power in this respect; but they have so exercised their power as to prevent the accumulation of wealth. It follows, that they have had to deal with poor, and therefore impotent subjects; and, of course, the real power of a Government over its subjects must be in proportion to their weakness. The Democracy of North America is not an exception to this general rule; for, do we not, there, see a whole people exercise the most terrible despotism over individuals? If the Government of America, that is, the great body of the people, were highly instructed, individuals would have nothing to fear from its power; but, at present, wrong is often inflicted on individuals, without benefit to the mass. An ignorant body of

men, in short, is just as liable as an ignorant individual, to commit self-injury and self-destruction. If you, as a Liberal, should be hurt at these remarks, I beg of you to tell me, whether partizan-murder may not be committed with impunity in Kentucky? and whether the American tariff be not a great injury to the whole people that has enacted it?

Hence you may conceive that this Government, or rather Governor, possesses extraordinary power for good or evil. How such a degree of power has been used for evil, you will learn, if you come here, merely by listening when you are at the Cape of Good Hope. Here, there is no particular reason for complaint; and I use the language of complaint unwillingly, merely because I could not otherwise give you a true picture of our condition. Need I say that there can be no court without courtiers? Of course, there is a pretty numerous class—numerous, I mean, in proportion to forty-five thousand inhabitants, altogether devoted to "His Excellency." This class forms the "best society" of Sydney. It is composed of Government officers, unconnected with the colony, excepting by their offices, of local magistrates, who are all settlers and landowners, and of the more opulent merchants, together with their respective wives. Now look back to what I have said of the original composition of the emigrants, not convicts. Do you smile at the picture which your imagination must have conceived? A court, an aristocracy, an exclusive set, persons of fashion, ladies patronesses, composed, King and all, of people such as the English who inhabit Boulogne;—a St. James's, a White's, an Almack's, at Botany Bay! It is true, as I hope to be saved. But why should you wonder?—Where did men and women ever congregate without the assumption, by a few of them, of superiority to the many? Nothing is more general—nothing, therefore, is more vulgar, than exclusiveness. Laugh rather at the thing itself than at its existence here.

As in France, the first class call themselves "*gens comme il faut*"; and in England, "people of fashion," or "the world"—so here the leaders of society are distinguished by a peculiar term. They are called "respectable." Not to speak of France, it is difficult to say what in England constitutes "fashion." Not high birth, certainly—for some of the despots of English society are sprung from the dunghill. Our epithet to express exclusiveness is, I think, better chosen—for though, strictly speaking, it means worthy of respect, it is claimed, here, only by those to whom respect is paid. In England, the *Quarterly*

Review tells us, "respectability" sometimes means keeping a gig—here it always means dining with the Governor.

You will readily understand, that an exclusive set being once established, those who compose it are jealous of their privileges. In this respect we do but mimic the "best society" of England. We are proud, shy, difficult of access to those whom we despise, presumptuous, sarcastic of whatever does not meet our notions of right, swollen, blinded with a sense of our own importance. In a word, we are "the world" at Botany Bay.—We look with an evil eye upon those who are rising to belong to us; we examine and canvass their pretensions; and we admit them, only after a long course of insult, to the honour of equal terms. They, in their turn, become excluders; and thus the farce proceeds—but is not this a picture of Grosvenor Square?

Our manners set the fashion. Those whom we exclude, exclude others. Free emigrants claim to be of a nature superior to convicts; convicts, whose terms of punishment have expired, behave as if their flesh and blood were wholly unlike that of convicts still in durance; convicts, who have not been convicted south of the line, scorn those who have; and these several classes, except the last, are as proud and tenacious of their privileges as is every distinctive class in England, except the unhappy lowest; or, as is every shade of colour in the West Indies except the perfect black. The main features of the human character are everywhere alike, and a passion for distinctions seems to be implanted in our nature.

RULING IDEA OF THE COLONY

Recollecting what has been said of the class to which you, as an emigrant, would belong, now learn that our most interesting subject of conversation is the price of wool. As our territory is extensive in proportion to its inhabitants, so, and for that very reason, our ideas are confined within a circle extremely narrow. Owing to the cheapness of land, it is impossible to obtain a revenue without labour of some kind; and farming is the most fashionable kind of labour. Owing to the scarcity of labouring hands, we produce hardly any commodity for foreign markets except wool, which may be produced almost without hands. Thus landlords and merchants think continually of wool, as did English landlords and merchants at the time when woolsacks were placed in the House of Lords, to fix the thoughts

of the legislature on what most deeply interested the community. We are in a barbarous condition, like that of every people scattered over a territory immense in proportion to their numbers; every man is obliged to occupy himself with questions of daily bread; there is neither leisure nor reward for the investigation of abstract truth; money-getting is the universal object; taste, science, morals, manners, abstract politics, are subjects of little interest, unless they happen to bear upon the wool question; and, what is more deplorable, we have not any prospect of a change for the better. When will the territory of this country be not immense in proportion to its inhabitants? I see that you do not like the picture. Should you like to live in Kentucky? But if you come here you will be a wool-grower; your mind will shrink to that narrow capacity, which is called *esprit de corps*; and you will then enjoy what now would disgust you. Did the members of the United Service Club ever tire of military concerns?—is the bar ever sick of lawyer's gossip?—do authors ever shun the subject of their own works? In England, however, there is an unavoidable variety, which gives a greater zest to the indulgence of every man's ruling idea. Here we have nothing but wool, wool, wool; and it will be thus to the end of a chapter, of which we have seen only the first page.

COLONIAL LADIES

But, you ask, do the women think of nothing but wool? *Ladies!* Sir, if you please. Women, indeed! I should like to hear you call our Governor's wife a woman. At a tea-party in New York, where I was the only man, I remarked that the men of America showed very bad taste, and a sad ignorance of what constitutes happiness, by prizing so little the society of women. "Women, indeed!" exclaimed a tall, slender, sallow girl, without teeth; "Women, indeed!" and then she turned up her nose and snorted, as if I had called her dog's wife. Similar tokens of displeasure were evinced by the whole circle. I felt that the word "women" had given offence. Cautiously, and fearing to make bad worse, I said "females"—"the society of females." Still wrong; I tried again;—"the sex," said I, in a deprecating, wheedling tone, "the society of the fair sex." No. Though the general scowl was somewhat relaxed, I felt quite confounded and wished for an earthquake to cover my embarrassment. At length, the first offended one—pitying me,

I suppose—gravely uttered "the ladies." "The ladies," shouted I—and all was right.

In new countries, where, for the reasons already given, narrow-mindedness *must* prevail, politeness consists entirely of forms; and the least infraction of those precise rules which make up the code of behaviour, is reckoned a grave offence. So it is here; not exactly because this is a new country—for it is not old enough to have a character of its own—but, because the greater part of those who have transported themselves hither were originally narrow-minded—because persons of enlarged views will not quit civilization and refinement, to vegetate in the wilderness. Some fifty years hence, Australasia will have a native stock of the attributes of newness;—it has those attributes now, but they are importations from England. Fifty years hence a Sydney tea-party will be dangerous ground for an uninitiated Englishman, not a prig;—even now it contains some awkward spots which are hidden from him, who is used only to the firm footing of truly polished intercourse. Am I not refining over-much? I admit it;—the barbarism of new countries is become my ruling idea.

Now I will answer your question. The ladies of Sydney do think of something besides wool. They think of household affairs, of beef, mutton, pork; of their convict maid-servants, who, however troublesome, are far better than none; of dress, earnestly, though not profoundly, as they study less to ornament their persons than to outvie their neighbours in finery; of questions of precedence, which furnish them with heart-burnings, bickerings, and desperate feuds; of their "respectability"; and of all those very, very little things, which occupy the minds of women not strongly tempted to acquire, either delightful knowledge, or the other arts, meaner than knowledge, by which superior men are pleased. Will you come here? Are there not plenty of vulgar bodies in England? Plenty. Then fancy one of them converted, by sudden elevation to the first place any where, into a vulgar fine lady, and you will form a pretty correct idea of a setter of fashions at Sydney. Mind—I am speaking only of our old or middle-aged ladies patronesses. There is a young race of striking beauty. The latitude of Sydney is 33⁰ south; that of Cyprus about 35⁰ north; the line of heat is north of the equator; all imported animals improve here. But I will not explain myself yet;—the "Currency Lassies," as they are vulgarly called, shall have a chapter to themselves.

POLITICS

You cannot believe that the men of New South Wales think absolutely of nothing but wool. I did not say so. I said, only, that wool forms their most interesting subject of conversation; that it is the ruling idea of the colony. Other matters obtain occasional notice. Some of these I will mention presently; but first, you must be made acquainted with a very curious feature of the colonial mind.

Remember where I am. I am standing, with my head downwards, as it were, almost under your feet. Your letter has made me think of you; but I am bound to confess that, for two or three years before I received it, the image of my old friend, my school crony, my college chum, the most intimate companion of my early and enthusiastic manhood, did never once cross my perverted thoughts. In all that time I never thought of you; not even once. Are you surprised? Remember where I am! Should we love our parents if, after the period of infancy, we were never reminded of them? Not more than the beasts that perish, which have no reason for keeping in remembrance the authors of their being. It is thus with the emigrant to a far distant land. He is severed from all that he once held dear, and is fixed immutably, where nothing occurs to remind him of his birthplace. As a plant, torn from the soil in which it germinated, and placed in one of a different nature, gradually accommodates itself to the new situation, and at length flourishes as if it had never been removed, so the wanderer from home, should he once take root in a foreign land, feels and acts as if he had been born there; his affections are utterly divorced from objects of early attachment; they are wedded to the new abode; he forgets the old country; the new country becomes to him all in all. This is peculiarly true of men, who, by emigrating, exchange poverty for comparative wealth, anxiety for peace of mind, misery for happiness. If that were possible, it would be still more true of poor emigrants who obtain property in land. Nearly all my fellow-colonists were once poor, and are now lords of the soil. Wonder not when I tell you, that they regard Old England with no more concern than a flourishing English yeoman bestows upon New South Wales. The above was a necessary introduction to some account of colonial politics. Into what parties are we divided? What are our standing questions?

As with you, we have "Government" and "Opposition."

You see the necessity of government, but wish to learn the purpose of opposition. The use of your opposition, regarding it not as a party, but as an act, is not always apparent. The existence of our opposition party must be explained by reference to the last paragraph. The Government is conducted by Englishmen connected with the colony only by their offices. These persons do not come here to remain. They are not settlers in any sense of the word. By the settlers, therefore, with whose indifference towards England you are acquainted, they are regarded as foreigners. They *are* foreigners, except by name. Their main interests and affections have reference only to England. They are mere sojourners here. They do not like the place, even as a temporary residence. How should they? Is it not Botany Bay? Having to deal with a population, of which far more than half the adults are criminals actually suffering punishment, they acquire the sentiments and manners of gaolers and turnkeys. They are overbearing, therefore; peremptory; quick at taking offence; suspicious; jealous of their almost boundless power; and yet fearful of the lawless body under their control, whom, at the same time, they despise. Nevertheless, their enormous power for good or evil procures them many partizans amongst the colonists. These, united with them, form the Government party. The Opposition consists of emancipated convicts who have attained wealth and importance, of the children of convicts, and of certain free emigrants—men of fiery, and, in many cases, of generous tempers; of whom some cannot tamely brook subjection in their own persons, some hate oppression in the abstract, and some are filled with a high ambition, like that which urged the robber-shepherd to found Rome. These are the leaders of four-fifths of the population. They are bent upon procuring for the colony a Government of colonial origin. They want Trial by Jury and a Legislative Assembly. They talk even of perfect Independence. They are rebels, every one of them, at heart; and nothing but a sense of weakness deters them from drawing the sword.

The state of Spain during the reign of Joseph Bonaparte offers a parallel to our political condition. We have a foreign King, the creature of a foreign power; foreign civil officers, a foreign army, domestic partizans of the foreign rule, and a people strongly disaffected. The likeness holds good in another important particular. As most of the Spanish partizans of J. Bonaparte were still essentially Spaniards, and were always

ready to have deserted the foreign King for a powerful Government purely Spanish; so the Australian partizans of the deputed British Government would, I believe, with very few exceptions, rejoice to obtain a domestic government, which is the avowed object of the Opposition. If the immediate independence of this country were a probable event, the whole body of colonists would form one party. At present they are divided into two parties—those who serve time and bow to circumstances, taking meanwhile all the good within their reach—and those who, regardless of time and seasons, have embarked their energies in a cause, which must be hopeless during their generation. The independence of Botany Bay! Of course, if you come here, you will belong to the Government party.

To one or other you must belong, unless you would prefer to be at enmity with both. Neutrality is out of the question. An English Churchman *may* live in peace between a Papist and a Methodist, because there are some points on which he can agree with both, as, indeed, the opinions of all three have a common foundation; but in this small colony, the disagreement of parties is absolute and universal. It admits of no compromise or qualification. It extends from the great speculative question of independence over all possible matters of opinion, and through every operation of the Government down to the least important act of the most humble public functionary. The hostility which it begets is bitter and unceasing, and the manner in which the warfare is conducted is dogmatical and personally offensive; because, in the first place, the opposing factions of our little capital are necessarily brought face to face, from year's end to year's end, and from morning to night; and, secondly, because cheapness of land and dearness of labour render men's minds as narrow as their territory is extensive, preventing not only the native growth of liberal feeling and polished manners, but also the importation from abroad of those attributes of civilization. Have I said enough to convince you that the state of parties, here, does not admit of neutrality?

This account of the intensity of party feeling is not at variance with my assertion that wool is the ruling idea of the colony. Of course you do not understand that assertion quite literally. It is, however, almost literally true. "Clearing" is the ruling idea of an American backwoodsman; and yet he may be a savage partizan of Clay or Jackson. It is just because the colonists are too much occupied with questions of daily bread, to have leisure for inquiry and reflection, that they make such violent

politicians. Were the leading men of both parties as rich as they would be, supposing land dear and labour cheap, they would have time and motive calmly to examine the great question that disturbs them. They would perceive, on the one hand, that this colony is not yet qualified to govern itself, even partially, by means of a colonial assembly; and, on the other hand, that its complete independence is, sooner or later, inevitable, supposing no decided alteration in the colonial policy of Britain. Having made these concessions to reason and truth, they would have a common object; that of securing every *attainable* good and cultivating the resources, and, above all, the minds of their countrymen, with a view to that self-government which must come, but which would prove a grievous curse, if it should come out of season and without due preparation.

It behoves me to satisfy you that we are not at present qualified to govern ourselves, and to state my reasons for presuming that our grand-children will assert their independence.

First, as to our incapacity for self-government. The population of the settlement may amount in round numbers to 45,000. Of these only 14,000, including women and children, have not been convicted of felony; and two-thirds of the remainder, seven-eighths being grown men, are galley-slaves, still in chains! Are you convinced?

Secondly, as to the probable epoch of our independence. This question may not be settled by a few figures. Indeed, it involves so many, and such grave considerations, that I have done wrong, perhaps, to touch upon it in a familiar letter. I will not, however, discuss the whole question; as it is not from me that you have to learn why a people, governed from afar, and continually increasing their territory, must have a continually increasing tendency to rebellion. I will therefore only point your attention to several circumstances, which, in this colony, are either peculiar or excessive, and which threaten to give an uncommonly rapid progress to the tendency just mentioned.

1. The very great distance between the government and the subjects, which far exceeds the space by which any former plantation, having free scope for the increase of people, was separated from a mother country. 2. In this colony there are neither warlike natives, nor dense forests, nor extensive swamps, nor impracticable mountains, to prevent the people from *spreading* till they shall become as wild as Tartars, and as awkward to catch. Nor are there any great navigable rivers to Com-

pensate, by affording easy communication between distant parts, for the want of savages, forests, swamps, and mountains.

3. Land is cheaper, and as soon as the present system of Penal Slavery shall be at an end, labour will be dearer, than in other new countries. I say that land is cheaper than elsewhere, because the use of land can be obtained at a less price. The settler in North America, though he should obtain a right to land for nothing, must pay largely for the use of that right. He must clear and drain his grant before he can use it, at a great cost of money or money's worth. Whereas, here, there are hundreds of thousands of square miles of unappropriated land, already cleared and drained by the hand of nature. Land, therefore, may be said to be cheaper, here, than in America. Cheapness of land is another expression for scarcity of labourers; and as land here is extraordinarily cheap, we may expect that, when the supply of convicts shall cease, labourers for hire will be excessively scarce. Thus we shall have excessive dearness of labour; but this is not all: we shall suffer also from an excessive scarcity of dear labour. As to this point, I must refer to the preceding remarks on the subject of labour. Dearness of labour, alone, would go far to prevent the accumulation of wealth; but a scarcity of dear labour will absolutely forbid it. Hence I judge that our grandchildren will be a race of unmixed barbarians, more *ungovernable* than even the white savages of Kentucky.

4. The democratic spirit which *must* exist, where every man possesses a little wealth and a little knowledge, but no man possessing much of either, will surely exist here. That this spirit cannot exist without hostility to England, the least democratic of free States, is proved by the history of Republican France, and of Independent America. Since the Americans opened roads over the chain of the Alleghanies, and thus obtained greater facilities for spreading, they are become less civilized, more democratical, and, I believe, more hostile to England, than in the days of Franklin and Washington. Hence, and looking also at the hatred of authority which has been imported, and is constantly maintained by criminal immigration, I conclude that the Australians will hate their parent country more bitterly, and at an earlier period, than did the British Colonists in America, because they will have greater facilities for growing up poor, ignorant, and democratical.

5. And lastly—coming now to the question of power. It was not the forests and swamps of America that enabled a handful of farmers and hucksters to defeat a powerful nation. If the

American colonists had accumulated wealth, and had been crowded together, though in the midst of forests and swamps, they might have been readily subdued. It was their poverty and their dispersion that constituted their strength. They had little to lose except their lives, and it was impossible to take their lives on a large scale because they were never to be caught congregated in masses. They met the force of Concentration, which is so useful in attack, by a successful defence, of which the essence was Dispersion. The Parthians of old, the Cossacks of late, and now the South American Republics, whose fruitless endeavours to destroy each other promise to be perpetual, have established, that Tartars, united in will and fighting on their own plains, are not to be conquered. From the foregoing considerations, it appears to me that Australasia is peculiarly adapted to become, and at a very early period too, the abode of a Tartar people. I conclude, therefore, that our grandchildren will govern, or rather misgovern, themselves.

INFLUENCE OF CONVICT LABOUR

So gloomy a view of our prospects appears, I know, at variance with what has actually occurred here. Little more than forty years ago this country was an absolute waste. By way of contrast, behold, in the parts first settled, the following proofs of wealth: a thriving capital and several inferior towns, the latter being larger and better constructed than the capitals of some English settlements in America, a hundred years after their foundation; excellent roads; productive turnpikes; crowded market-places; public hotels, superior to the best in North America, even at this late hour; warehouses, through which there is a constant flow of luxuries from all parts of the world; public carriages, almost as well managed as those of England; an astonishing number of private carriages built in Long-Acre; several newspapers, and other periodical works; booksellers' shops, well supplied from Europe; two banks of deposit and discount; many churches and chapels; very good schools for rich and poor; scientific, literary, and philanthropic societies; a botanical garden; a turf club; packs of hounds; dinner parties, concerts, and balls; fine furniture, plate, and jewels; and though last, not least, many gradations in society, being so many gradations in wealth. "All this," I hear you exclaim, "in forty years! No North American colony made half the progress in

double the time! In all modern history there is no parallel case of creation from nothing—and by a parcel of thieves, too! That Australia must possess some happy quality denied to other new countries, and still a mystery, like the instinct of the carrier-pigeon, of which we know nothing but its results! Surely, so fortunate a people will not degenerate into barbarism."

Perhaps not; but attend, for this matter concerns you deeply. In settling a perfectly waste country, the main object, as well as the chief difficulty, is to produce on the spot, food for the first emigrants, and a surplus quantity for those who are to follow them. For the passage of this asses' bridge, in the process of founding a colony, one thing is indispensable—capital; that is, seed-corn, cattle for stock, implements of husbandry, and food to keep the settlers alive, whilst producing food for the future; but the epoch of success will be determined by two other things, over which the settlers can exercise no control—namely, the state of the soil to be cultivated, and the nature of the climate. In the case of every plantation in North America, whether English, French, or Dutch, the settlers had to contend with a soil which, being covered with dense forests, required much labour, and with a climate which incapacitated them for labour. It followed, of course, that they should struggle for a long while with hunger, produced by sickness, and with sickness again, produced by hunger. In every case, many years, and, in some cases more than forty years, elapsed, before the emigrants escaped out of that vicious circle. Now, in all that has been written of the untimbered, grassy regions, and the glorious climate of Australasia, there is not a word of exaggeration. Even here, however, famine made some havoc amongst the first settlers, until they had passed the thickly timbered district near the coast. But when their cows led them to those green plains, they could sow and reap without the labour of "clearing"; their cattle grew fat, and multiplied rapidly; the asses' bridge was passed; and the advantage, so quickly gained, was, from the nature of its causes, imperishable. If you would thoroughly appreciate the merits of clear land and a wholesome climate, compare Mr. Cunningham's account of our new settlement at Bathurst with Captain Beaver's Journal of an attempt at colonization on the western coast of Africa. At Bathurst, only one settler died in the course of several years; at Bulama, the whole colony was in the hospital at once. I acknowledge, therefore, that nature has bestowed those very great merits on this country; but they are not of a mysterious nature, for their

operation is as manifest as their results. Nor do they account for the actual wealth of the colony. They explain only why an ample supply of food was obtained at a very early period; but food, taken by itself, is not wealth. Whence have come all those things, over and above mere subsistence, which astonish the beholder, when he reflects that this colony has been planted little more than forty years?

An example has just passed my window, in the shape of a dashing English landau. It contains a "lady," who married a poor half-pay lieutenant, and who now drinks tea that would cost in England twenty shillings the pound. They emigrated to New South Wales in 1815. But how did she get that carriage, and how does she manage to send to China for the gunpowder? Thus:—Her husband is both landowner and merchant. Being constantly supplied with a number of convict labourers, he breeds cattle and cultivates grain; and, as he gives to his labourers but just enough for their subsistence, he has a large surplus produce. Having sold to the local government wheat and beef for the supply of prisons, hospitals, and barracks, he is paid partly with bills upon the English treasury, and partly with dollars, sent from England for the support of the great penitentiary. He remits one of those bills to his London agent, and desires him to purchase, with the proceeds thereof, a superb landau. In less than a year, his wife "rides in her coach." He sends some of the dollars to Canton, and purchases therewith a cargo of tea, of which he gives to his wife as much as she likes, and sells the rest to the wives of other men, who pay him with bills or dollars, received again from the government for wheat and beef. Thus, you see, Mrs.——is indebted for two decided proofs of wealth to the prevalence of crime in England. Even the coat of arms on her landau was found by your Heralds' College, in return for a part of the proceeds of that bill, which was drawn *to pay for the food of the soldiers who drove the convicts, who produced the food.* Our old friend Sir George Nayler would no doubt start at being told of his obligation to the pickpockets of London. And the rogues are little aware of their influence in political economy; but I have stated a plain fact, which, if you have any doubts about it, pray submit both to Sir George himself, and to Mr. M'Culloch.

That is, indeed, an ill wind which blows no good. We owe everything, over and above mere subsistence, to the wickedness of the people of England. Who built Sydney? Convicts. Who made the excellent roads from Sydney to Parramatta, Windsor

and Liverpool? Convicts. By whom is the land made to produce? By convicts. Why do not all our labourers exact high wages, and, by taking a large share of the produce of labour, prevent their employers from becoming rich? Because most of them are convicts. What has enabled the landowner readily to dispose of his surplus produce? The demand of the keepers of convicts. What has brought so many ships to Port Jackson, and occasioned a further demand for agricultural produce? The transportation of convicts. What has tempted free emigrants to bring capital into the settlement? The true stories that they heard of fortunes made by employing the cheap labour of convicts. But here are questions and answers enough. The case is plain. Nearly all that we possess has arisen from the happy influence of penal emigration and discipline, on production, distribution, and consumption. Thanks to the system of transportation, we have had cheap labour and a ready market; production, consequently, has exceeded consumption, and the degree of that excess is the measure of our accumulation—that is, of our wealth.¹

But will transportation continue to exert the same happy influence on our condition? I think not. If for every acre of land that may be appropriated here, there should be a conviction for felony in England, our prosperity would rest on a solid basis; but, however earnestly we may desire it, we cannot expect that the increase of crime will keep pace with the spread of colonization. What, then, must happen? Every day sees an increase in the number of employers of labour, without a proportionate increase in the number of labourers. As convicts are fairly distributed amongst those who want them, the general increase of demand diminishes the supply to each settler. Twenty thousand convicts, divided amongst five hundred settlers, would give to each settler forty pair of hands, wherewith to obtain for his wife a superb landau and plenty of gunpowder; but divide the same number of convicts amongst ten times the number of settlers and poverty, in respect to everything above mere subsistence, must be the lot of all. During forty years we have combined the fire and water of political economy—cheap land and cheap labour. The result is no doubt astonishing: but, as that strange union of contradictions is almost at an

¹ "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 supporting convicts and from convict labour."—*Suggestions on the propriety of re-introducing British Convict Labour into British North America.* By a Canadian. London, 1824.

end, so what it has produced will vanish like a steam-cloud produced by the fire and water of physics, which can be maintained only by the constant action of its cause. The union of cheapness of labour with cheapness of land depended on *the proportion* which labour bore to appropriated land. Alter that proportion, either by diminishing the quantity of labour, or increasing the quantity of land, and you dissolve the unnatural union. Every day, I must repeat, sees an increase in the quantity of land, whilst the quantity of labour remains the same. Ten years hence land will be as cheap as ever, and we shall talk of cheap labour as a thing that was. Ten years hence, perhaps sooner, the peculiar cheapness of land, which is a natural attribute of this country, must operate without a check; the accumulation of wealth must cease; and most of that creation from nothing, which astonishes the hasty observer, will gradually perish.

These are my opinions. If I am not mistaken, I am not wrong in supposing that we shall become a Tartar people. "Perhaps not," you say; "but why bore me by dwelling so wearisomely on cheap land and dear labour?" Because, I answer, you have asked for information about a new country.

WOOL QUESTION

You ask me in particular, whether the emigrant to New South Wales, having capital, may expect to make large profits by the growth of wool? In direct opposition to the ruling idea of my fellow-colonists, I answer—No. Here, I should not for the life of me, dare to express such an opinion, much less to support it by argument; but to you, whose passions are not yet interested in the subject, and who desire not flattery but truth, I may venture to state both sides of the question. You will afterwards judge for yourself.

In favour of the speculation—First, the unlimited extent of natural pasturage will allow an unlimited increase of sheep. Secondly, the food provided by nature is peculiarly agreeable to the animal, but not more so than the climate, which, it is now ascertained, causes a great improvement in the native fleece. Thirdly, owing to an abundance of natural food throughout the year, and to our mild climate, which forbids the use of clothes or buildings, as well as to the very nature of the pursuit, sheep farming may be conducted with very little labour. It is not affected therefore by that colonial curse, the scarcity of labour.

Fourthly, as wool is light, and nearly imperishable, it may easily be conveyed to market, notwithstanding the want of internal communications, which, in respect to heavier and less durable goods, would check production, even though labour were plentiful. Fifthly, there exists in England a demand for Australian wool, where also there is a supply of goods required by us. Thus we have a market of exchange for the commodity that we can most readily furnish. Lastly, very considerable fortunes have been made and secured, and even carried to England, by Australian flock-masters.

On the other hand, against the speculation, there are all the circumstances apparently in favour of it, not excepting even the last. Your question, mind, applies not to quantity, but to profit only. Last year we exported to England above 1,500,000 lbs. of wool. Our fine wooled sheep, of which none that will live are killed, double themselves every third year. Your demand for foreign wool somewhat exceeds 30,000,000 lbs. We might, therefore, in less than fifteen years, supply the whole of your demand, and a great deal more. That we shall do so within twenty years I firmly believe. For the six reasons stated above, there is no assignable limit to our capacity for production, and there is every possible encouragement to over-production. May not, then, the wool-grower of Australasia be permanently, like the French wine-growers at this time, "rich in goods, and yet ruined"? Not so, you think. The laws of political economy will operate as usual; the want of profit will divert capital to some other employment; and a diminution of supply will enliven the market and raise the price. This argument is, no doubt, conclusive when applied to the glut of a commodity of which the production is expensive. As soon as the poorer wine-growers of France shall be destroyed by lowness of price, a less quantity will be produced, and those who weather the storm of low prices will once more obtain satisfactory profits. So also the over-production of wool in Germany, where rent, taxes, and an unfavourable climate, occasion heavy expenses, would cure itself by means of low prices and the diversion of capital. But here, remember, wool may be produced almost without expense. Indeed, now that we have an ample stock of fine fleeced sheep the quantity would increase of its own accord, if not in spite of us. The demand, it is evident, will not keep pace with our production, and the over-production will be perpetual. What must result but a gradual fall of prices and permanent low profits? I do not pretend of course, that we shall continue

to send wool to England, unless you continue to offer us a remunerating price. All I assert is that we shall very soon produce so large a quantity as to bring down the price far below the mark of high profits, and that a continued excess of production will maintain perpetual low prices.

Still, you say, large fortunes have been made in New South Wales by breeding sheep. Unquestionably; but if you inquire into the causes of that fact, and look at its effects, you will not mention it again as an argument in favour of the speculation. Hitherto the demand for wool has been equal to the supply, and those who took advantage of the extraordinary facilities for production which this country affords, have obtained high prices for a commodity which cost them very little. Those very facilities, I have endeavoured to show, now threaten to alter the relation between demand and supply, and to cause a proportionate fall of price and of profits. But our rich sheep-farmers owe their fortunes, not so much to the high price, in proportion to the cost of production which they have hitherto obtained for wool, as to the monopoly which they have had of an article still more in demand than wool itself—namely, fine-fleeced sheep. Mr. Macarthur, for instance, who was the first to perceive how admirably this country is suited to sheep-farming, made more money by the sale of sheep to his fellow colonists than by the sale of fleeces to the wool-staplers of London. Possessing, upon this subject, a monopoly of good sense, foresight, and enterprise, he brought into the colony a stock of fine-wooled sheep, and thus secured, during several years, a most profitable monopoly in trade. But the advantage that he, and others who followed his example, enjoyed for some time, has already exhausted itself. The supply of sheep *for stock* is already equal to the demand; a great fall in price has ensued; and as sheep increase much faster than people, there is no chance of an alteration favourable to the flock-owner. Consequently, we must not infer that, because at one time riches were obtained by sheep-farming, that pursuit will bestow riches in future. Indeed, looking now at the effects of the fact which I admit—at the eager desire which it has created amongst all classes here to extend the production of wool; at your London companies formed for that purpose, with their two millions of capital; at the number of emigrants that it has brought, and is still bringing to the Colony, provided with crack flocks, and bent upon driving the Spaniards and Saxons out of the English market;—looking, I say, at all these immediate consequences

of past success in sheep-farming, I think that the undoubted fact will be one main cause of over-production and low profits in future. In support of this opinion, I must tell you that the breeding of coarse-wooled sheep *for mutton* was, until lately, a very profitable trade; but that now all the meat of a fat wether sells for little more than the cost of driving him to market, killing him, skinning him, cutting him up, and selling him piece-meal.¹ Where then is the return for breeding and fattening him? Why, the truth is, that Nature, who is not particular about returns, conducts nearly all that part of the business. I have read that at one time the price of a horse in South America was 200 ounces of gold, and of a cow 150 ounces. Not many years later, as now in some of the plains eastward of the Andes, cows and horses were to be had for the catching. I do not mean to say that Australasia will abound in wild wool to be obtained on such very easy terms, because sheep, if allowed to run wild, would either degenerate or perish; but extraordinary facilities for unlimited and almost costless production interdict large profits; Nature has provided those facilities; Mr. Macarthur and his followers have taken care that they shall operate to the utmost, and large profits, therefore, are henceforth, in my humble opinion, out of the case.

If you could procure a conviction for felony in England for every half dozen lambs that may be dropped here, or for, what would amount to the same thing, every acre of land granted by the crown, then, indeed, the increase of people, and of demand for mutton and wool, would keep pace with production, and the case would be wholly altered. But where is the use of wishing for impossibilities? Carefully examine both sides of the question, and judge for yourself.

A bright thought lately entered my head—it was this. Suppose that your Parliament should make it a transportable offence to contract marriage without a provision for children;² and

¹ "At this time" (a sudden and but temporary demand for mutton having arisen) "many persons considered themselves fortunate in having an opportunity of diminishing their flocks, by killing the ewes when heavy with lamb. They spoke of them as *vermin*, which, if they were not kept down, would soon overrun the country. An indiscriminate slaughter and destruction of stock was kept up during the whole year of 1820; and the people were at last surprised to find that their flocks were greatly diminished,—that it was a *less evil* to have too much stock than too little,—and that it would not be impracticable to exterminate it altogether."—*Account of Van Diemen's Land* by Edward Curr. Page 67.

² "*Brighton Police—Present*, S. F. Milford and W. Seymour, Esqrs. —George Back, attended by his wife and five small children, requested the bench would order the overseers to give him some employ, or that his children might be taken to the poor-house. He had applied every-

that we, in return for the incalculable benefits thereby conferred upon us, should defray the whole cost of transportation; would not all parties be gainers by the measure? You would save nearly the whole amount of your poor-rates, and of what you must otherwise spend in the prevention and punishment of crimes dictated by misery; we should gain more millions than you would save; for, though each unhappy pair should cost us fifty pounds, their labour and the labour of their children, would repay us a thousand fold, and the new married convicts, poor things, whom we should receive with open arms, would be the greatest gainers of all; as, wanting the means of subsistence, they would obtain plenty for themselves and a fine provision for their children. In the penal Act suggested it would be well to insert these clauses:—1st. Provided that persons transported as aforesaid, shall, immediately on touching the shores of Australia, be at liberty *to dispose of their labour to the highest bidder*, 2nd. Provided that parties accused of the offence created by this Statute shall not be prosecuted *without their free consent in writing first had and obtained*. These provisions would take off the seeming harshness of the law, and would, no doubt, promote convictions; but *it* would at the same time be absolutely necessary to forbid the transports from becoming owners of land. Otherwise, as before explained, they would not remain labourers, but would become employers of labourers. What think you of the plan? When I mentioned it to our Chief Justice, he, thinking I meant to insult him, coloured up, and said, "are you mad?" I did not answer, but took comfort, repeating to myself after the Abbe Raynal, "Madmen sometimes utter words of profound meaning."

where, both in town and country, but could not meet with any employ. He said that he was willing to work, if he could get any. Mr. Harper, the assistant overseer, stated that the parish had given the applicant work; but now, as the time was coming on when work would be plentiful, the directors and guardians had given orders that the applicant should seek work. The directors and guardians could not find work for every applicant all the year round; besides, Back was not an industrious man; the whole family were an idle set, and not willing to work. The applicant denied the charge, which he said might be very convenient. Mr. Harper had threatened to punish him if he applied to the magistrates for relief. What was he to do with his family?—he had tried every place. Mr. Seymour—"These misfortunes occur through the impropriety of poor persons marrying without any thoughts of how they are to maintain a wife and family. Persons who possess small property should have the precaution to remain single. *Poor persons have no right to marry*, throwing a heavy burden on the parish by their families. It is a very great evil. The magistrates recommend the parish should find the applicant work, with the understanding that he should obtain other employment, if possible."—*Brighton Guardian Newspaper*, September 10, 1829.

VAN DIEMEN'S LAND

The whole of this report applies quite as much to Van Diemen's Land as to New South Wales. There is a slight difference of soil and climate between the two settlements, and a certain difference, of course, in some of the productions for which each is best adapted. Van Diemen's Land, for example, yields better apples and wheat; New South Wales superior oranges and maize; but in point of salubrity there is no difference, and the quantity of valuable produce to be obtained from any given area is the same in both places. It is easy to explain why, independently of soil and climate, this account of one settlement may be taken as a description of the other. In fact they are one and the same colony, peopled by emigrants from the same country; who came here in the same manner, and with the same dispositions; who use the same language, obey willingly or unwillingly the same laws, have acquired the same habits, enjoy the same advantages, feel the same wants, indulge the same high hopes, and are fated to the same disappointment. Still, are not these settlements parted by the ocean? No, they are united by a strait. Water is every where the best of roads for bringing together distant places. Without the great civilization of England, London would be nearer to Hamburg than to Birmingham. Here, where canals are out of the question, and where the few roads of which I have boasted are due entirely to a forced cheapness of labour, now coming to its end, the operation of water in contracting absolute space is far more evident than in any part of Europe. The inhabitants of Hobart's Town and Sydney are nearer neighbours than two families in the district of Bathurst, who may be separated by only fifty miles of unreclaimed land. A farmer of Van Diemen's Land sells corn in the market of Sydney, whilst many a New South Wales farmer grows no more corn than will supply his family, because he would be unable to remove a surplus quantity from his own barn. The shopkeeper of Launceston, again, can sell Chinese goods obtained from Sydney for less than the shopkeeper of Bathurst, who, on the map, appears nearer to Sydney by some hundred miles. In a word, ships, and water to float them on, are, to the inhabitants of new countries, what wagons, carriages, inns, and Macadam's roads are to you. Believe, then, that New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land are connected, not separated, by Bass's Strait.

It is true, however, that the English Governors of Australasia

have begun to establish the old-fashioned institution of coast-blockade in this newest world, and so to convert that friendly bond, the sea, into a hostile barrier. As if their subjects were not criminal enough: or willing, perhaps, that those who have been brought here by smuggling should resume their old trade, that they have bestowed upon us a "Commercial System." One of its provisions deserves to be known. For the declared purpose of forcing the northern settlers of Van Diemen's Land to buy and sell at the southern extremity of the island, it has been ordered that English goods imported from Port Jackson to Port Dalrymple shall pay an extraordinary duty; but the object of this absurd measure has not been attained. The dealers of Launceston would not travel across the island to deal at Hobart's Town. They preferred to give something more, and receive something less, in their own shops. The duty is paid, either to Government or to the smugglers, and goods are exchanged as before. The sea, therefore, still enables fellow-countrymen and brothers, living on either shore of Bass's Strait, to maintain an intimate connection. And it will continue to perform that office; for though, no doubt, the duty in question may for a time lengthen the commercial distance between New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land,—just as an extra duty on Port wine, imported any where but at Leith, would lengthen the commercial distance between Lisbon and Southampton,—still men die, and their absurdities perish; whilst the principles of reason and justice are eternal, and the world's knowledge of them increases from day to day.

Why am I so angry with our rulers for treating these districts of Australasia as "natural enemies"? Because I am an apostate from their view of the subject. I did not think of pulling the mote out of their eye till I had cast the beam out of my own. On my passage to this place, by way of North America, I built many castles in the air. I then intended to settle in Van Diemen's Land, because I fancied that its insular position and small extent would render it, not merely foreign, but also superior, to New South Wales. All the land, thought I, in that beautiful island will soon be appropriated. The people will increase rapidly, and will be unable to spread. The proportion between people and territory will be like that of an old country. Labour, therefore, will be plentiful, and, perhaps, even cheap; at least, there will not be a scarcity of dear labour. Division of labour will follow. That will cause, as, indeed, nothing else can cause, great production. Wages being moderate, the employer of

labour will take a large share of a great produce. This will cause accumulation; and the accumulated produce of labour is wealth. Wealth will bestow leisure; and leisure will bestow knowledge. Wealth, leisure, and knowledge mean civilization. Schools and colleges will be established. The arts and sciences will flourish, because artists and discoverers will be paid and honoured. Abstract truth will be sought, because its pursuit will be rewarded; and this will make philosophers. A little island of the Southern Ocean will produce painters, sculptors, poets, orators, and friends of mankind. A nation will be born free, under a clear sky, and will be highly instructed. Being a new people, they will reject the prejudices, whilst they improve the accumulated knowledge, of other worlds; and at length it will be fairly decided whether or not man can reach perfection.

Moreover my estate of ten thousand acres will yield a rent of ten thousand pounds a-year!

This was my foolish dream. Its basis was delusion, which vanished in America. I became acquainted with a citizen at New York, whose eldest son was still a youth at college. The father wished that his boy should continue to study for three years longer, and it was proposed that he should afterwards visit Europe, to gather knowledge that might make him useful to his country. The stripling was in love with a neighbour's daughter, and not much inclined to study. He asked his father's leave to marry and become a man; that is, to make nails for his coffin by making children whilst yet a child, and to smoke, drink rum before breakfast, and choose a side in the paltry, but violent, party politics of the state. The father objected, mentioning the affectionate reasons that weighed with him, and the son asserted, what in America is called the dignity of human nature, by departing with his neighbour's daughter, and settling in the back woods, twelve hundred miles from home. Afterwards, on the banks of the Illinois, I met with a labouring man, who was always tipsy without ever being drunk. Enervated by dram-drinking, he had not the courage to obtain a bit of forest and settle; but he could earn seven shillings a day by his labour. When I spoke to him, he complained of low wages. "At New York, friend," said I, "five shillings a day are thought quite enough." "I know that," he answered; "I was born there, and came here to get eight shillings a day, which, I was told, was the lowest rate hereabouts." It turned out that he never worked more than three days in the week, and that, in order to obtain twenty-four shillings a week by three days'

labour, he had made a circuitous voyage of some thousand miles from the place where he was born, and where he could have earned thirty shillings a week by working every day.

These and many similar instances of the migrating habits of the Americans, opened my eyes. I saw a people without monuments, without history, without local attachments founded on impressions of the past, without any love of birthplace, without patriotism—unless men constantly roaming over immense regions may be called a country. I saw Europeans, the only visitors at the grave of Franklin, and heard Americans titter at Englishmen for admiring the other founders of America. I learned that, with a new people, restlessness is a passion, insatiable whilst any means of indulging it remain; a disease, incurable but by cutting away its source. "What a blessing!" I exclaimed, "for the present race of Americans, if the Pacific should overflow all the land that separates it from the Mississippi!" And then it occurred to me that my hopes of Tasmania were a dream, which could not come true, unless the rest of Australasia were swallowed by the sea. What had been my delusion? I had fancied that the waves which surround Van Diemen's Land would prevent its inhabitants from spreading; and that CONCENTRATION would produce what never did and never can exist without it—CIVILIZATION. I know now that it is easier to migrate from the coast of Van Diemen's Land to the Southern and Eastern coasts of Australia, which present a line of many thousand miles, than from some interior parts of the island to others not fifty miles distant. I believe, therefore, that New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land are one and the same colony, and that they will become, at the same time, districts of one and the same country, remaining equally barbarous till the year 3000, and becoming afterwards equally civilized, if the world should last so long.

INFLUENCE OF TRANSPORTATION ON COLONIAL MANNERS AND HABITS

Why then do I remain here, my only stake in the country being those 20,000 acres, which are not worth staying for? I will tell you presently. There are few pictures without a bright side; but first let me show you the whole dark side of this one.

You will not accuse me of underrating the value of convicts.

To make it impossible, however, I once more declare my belief that this is a flourishing settlement, merely because it is a Penal settlement, and that it would immediately fall into a state of torpor and insignificance, if your Government should abandon the system of transportation. That system, indeed, is itself a system of colonization; and as colonization means the creation and increase of everything but land, where there is nothing except land, any system, provided that colonization must be pursued at all events, is surely better than none. Where else, in modern times at least, has colonization been pursued with any kind of system? Still the system is full of evil. So long as the whole colonial population consisted only of criminals and their keepers, there was no ground for complaint; because, though the keepers had not committed felony, they were not obliged to live with felons unless they liked it. But the case is now greatly altered. I say nothing of those Englishmen who wilfully migrated to a penal settlement; and it is of no importance, therefore, whether or not the British Government encouraged them to settle here. But they brought children with them; they have produced children here; convicts also brought and have produced children; and the native Australasians form the cream, the flower of the colony. Not one of these either is a felon, or could have avoided living amongst felons. They were born, every one of them, with the very same rights as belong to native Englishmen, and they have done nothing to forfeit any of those rights. Is not an Englishman's first right equality before the law? But if the law should direct all rogues convicted in Yorkshire to be domiciliated in Kent, would not the Men of Kent complain, and with truth, of a shameful violation of their birthright?—Of course; but the cases are not parallel, unless we suppose the Men of Kent to bear as small a proportion to the inhabitants of Yorkshire as that of the native Australasians to the whole people of Britain. It would be just to drive one man mad by passing a rail-road close to his study, in order that the numerous inhabitants of two towns should exchange their wares somewhat more quickly; the few, in short, must suffer for the good of the many.—The maxim is a good one, but not applicable to this question unless we first prove that it is impossible to serve the many without injuring the few. If the two towns could be accommodated by passing a rail-road anywhere but close to the man's study, it would be cruelly unjust to drive him mad. Now, nothing can be more evident than that British criminals might, for all British purposes, be transported to parts of

Australasia where there are no British subjects to injure.—Yes; but then the greater expence of fresh establishments?—That might be a question of fact; but admit the fact, and allow also, that in order to save the pockets of the many, it is just to inflict a great moral injury on the few; still, what if the moral injury must necessarily descend to the successors of the few; and if it be certain that the injured will, in time, acquire a numerical proportion to the benefited, such as to throw the words few and many out of the argument? What if, in the case of the rail-road, it were sure that the studious man's madness would descend from him to a number equal to the inhabitants of both towns? In that case, clearly, the injury must not be done.—But the constant influx of criminals into New South Wales is, though a moral injury in one respect, a great pecuniary benefit, and in that point of view a moral benefit because wealth is the parent of civilization.—Let us not confound the past with the present, much less with the future. The effect of penal slavery in producing wealth must, as has been already explained, depend altogether on the proportion of cheap slaves to the employers of slave-labour. If, henceforth, convicts shall be fairly divided amongst all who want labourers, they will not confer wealth upon any man. If they should be unfairly distributed by favour, so as to bestow upon a few persons only the means of wealth, that would not be a general benefit; and such partiality would be injurious, in another light, by causing furious ill-will amongst the colonists. It follows that to domiciliate the criminals of Britain amongst those British subjects not criminal, who reside in Australasia, is unjust and wicked, provided the system be calculated to do the latter and their posterity a great moral injury.

That the system abounds with evil it will not be difficult to establish.

In the first place, The insecurity of life and property that it occasions is a manifest evil. Bush-ranging is a dreadful evil, being a kind of land piracy. None but back settlers, it is true, are exposed to its burnings, rapes and massacres; but these are as much British subjects as the inhabitants of Sydney or of Downing-street. And, if the inhabitants of towns escape those horrors, they are liable to be murdered in a quiet way, and their property is exposed to every kind of depredation. Their actual losses by robbery, including the expence and loss of time occasioned by prosecutions, are very great.

Secondly, The population not legally criminal, is corrupted

by the constant example of crime, and the frequent sight of bloody punishments. What sense of right can children acquire, where villainy is the rule, and honesty the exception; where they must needs associate familiarly with depraved men and women, who use every art to convert them to vice; where law has no moral force; where general opinion favours the criminal; where to break the law is a merit, and to elude its grasp an honourable achievement; where, above all, human beings are continually hanged in rows, as cattle are slaughtered in the French abattoirs? Is not this an evil?

Thirdly, Convict labour being a kind of slavery, the employer of convicts is a species of slave-driver, and his children are little slave-drivers. As his slaves have more rights and more reason than the black slaves of Virginia, his position is more injurious to his character than that of the Virginian slave-owner. Unless you are a natural devil, you can treat your horses and dogs without cruelty; but if those brutes should acquire some of the rights and reason of men, they would make a devil of you in spite of your natural good temper. You may kill them now without hindrance or punishment;—therefore you never think of such a thing; but if they could complain of you, and get you punished for beating them, or for giving them too little oats and tripe, you would often long to kill them, and you might gratify your wish by a safe, legal, slow-torture process, far more cruel than the poleaxe and the rope. God help the poor horse whose master returns to *it*, in his own snug stable, after being fined under Mr. Martin's Act for beating it in public! The Guardian of Slaves at the Cape of Good Hope, reports "instances of ill-treatment, which may be ascribed to a tendency in some parts of the slave population to acts of insubordination arising, perhaps, from an erroneous idea respecting the rights of the master, the intention of the Government in the appointment of a Guardian, and the nature of the protection to be afforded by that officer." Of course! To place men in the situation of cattle, with rights, reason and a guardian, was to increase the quantity, though it might alter the character, of the sufferings which they endured whilst they remained nominal men, but real cattle. One can imagine a kind master of down-right slaves; but to drive men, half slaves and half freemen, *must* make the driver a brute. Here, also, we have guardians of slaves. But our slaves have more rights and more intelligence than those of any other colony. There is more "insubordination/" consequently, on the one hand, and on the other, more

fear. Apply to the well known character of a Virginian planter an extra dose of those qualities which spring from quarrelling and terror, and you will see that the injury done to the character of the master by our slave system, is quite perfect. Is not this a great evil?

Fourthly, The base language of English thieves is becoming the established language of the colony. Terms of slang and flash are used, as a matter of course, everywhere, from the gaols to the Viceroy's palace, not excepting the Bar and the Bench. No doubt they will be reckoned quite parliamentary, as soon as we obtain a parliament. It is common to reproach the Americans with having departed from the language of their ancestors; but the fact is, that most of the words which we suppose them to have coined, are current, at this day, in different parts of England. Dear old Franklin tried in vain to establish the best English in America. Had he lived till now, experience would have taught him that, whilst *in* old countries modes and manners flow downwards from the higher classes, they must, in new countries, ascend from the lowest class. Though in England the son of a costermonger may become a peer, the individual donkey-driver cannot—whereas a great portion of the magnates of Australasia not only may, but necessarily must, have formed, in their own persons, part of the dregs of society. Hence, bearing in mind that our lowest class brought with it a peculiar language, and is constantly supplied with fresh corruption, you will understand why pure English is not, and is not likely to become, the language of the colony. This is not a very serious evil; and I mention it only to elucidate what follows.

Fifthly, The system of transportation is establishing, along with a base language, and in the very same manner, a general habit of drunkenness. No wonder that some Americans should have formed "Societies for the suppression of Dram-drinking." But will their exertions prove successful, whilst modes and manners continue to flow upwards to, instead of downwards from, their proper source? The actual source of the drunken habits which brutify this people is your St. Giles's; and the foul stream is constantly maintained by you. What need I say more, after noticing that the temperature of this part of Australasia is like that of the countries for which Mahomet legislated?

Lastly, The transportation of at least ten males for one female, maintains a great disproportion between the sexes. This is the greatest evil of all. If I hate anything, it is Cant. And I should think it impertinent to obtrude upon anyone my notions

of individual morality. But this is a great public evil; and in a public sense, I have a right to speak of its consequences with indignation. The subject, however, is a grave one, and shall be treated gravely. Know, then, that, in this British colony, open, naked, broad-day, prostitution is as common as in Otaheite. Are there not societies in England, which have expended millions in sending men and books to the heathen? Why do not they send some women to this abandoned community of their fellow Christians? Are not those devout persons surrounded by unfortunates, who become prostitutes for want of bread? Tell them that, here, prostitution is owing solely to the want of women, and that there is abundance of bread for any number of poor creatures that they might mercifully send to us. Tell them, moreover, that if they will equalize the sexes, we offer a husband, plenty, and a virtuous life, to every one of the miserable beings whom they may charitably withdraw from sin and misery. Can they, though, be ignorant of the depravity that reigns here? For what do they combine and subscribe? For the promotion of religion and morality all over the world! And are they not intimately acquainted with the vices of savages in obscure regions, to which none but their own active missionaries can penetrate? If you think that they do not know the condition of these their fellow-subjects, inform them of it. Tell them in plain terms, so as to leave them without the excuse of ignorance, that every female child in this colony, not defended by parents of some influence, is sure to be hunted by a dozen roaring lions, and that her destruction is almost inevitable; that the frequency of early corruption has already established a general license of manners; that mothers are not ashamed to sell their own daughters, even before the young creatures know what chastity means; that husbands make a market of their wives; that early prostitution occasions barrenness; and that the origin of all this evil—the inequality of the sexes—is partly maintained by the evil itself.

Do they imagine that the evil may be cured otherwise than by equalizing the sexes? Would they make prostitution a legal offence? Would they put an end to the general corruption of females, by restraining and punishing incontinence? Let them beware! Let them first consult some captains of men-of-war, or his Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, who, if truly informed of the moral state of this people, will tell them, for God's sake, to beware! It is a fact, a miserable truth, that the most virtuous and sensible of the Colonists are fain to

rejoice at every addition to the class of prostitutes; at every sale, that is, of a female child by her own parents, of a wife by her own husband; at the earliest possible destruction of innocence; at the greatest possible female corruption. Good and wise men, they choose the least of two dreadful evils. Can it be true that this colony is within the jurisdiction of an English bishop, and that we have a body of regular clergy, with many other Christian ministers, not wanting in zeal? Yes, this is true; and yet habits are taking a firm root amongst the people, which must gradually become indigenous, national; and which, in time, may not leave ten righteous to save the city. Blame neither the clergy nor the people. Blame the system, which leaves not even a choice of evils, but decrees, as plainly as ever cause produced effect, that either evil can be less, only as the other is greater; and that, in whatever proportion to each other, both shall, by the force of example and habit, increase with the increase of people, notwithstanding the ultimate removal of the original cause.

Do you doubt the fact, because it is not reported in published accounts of the colony? Remember that hitherto the proportion of cheap slaves to their employers has conferred wealth upon the latter; that every employer of labour longs within the most selfish recesses of his heart, for an increase in the amount of transportation, and loudly expresses his dread lest the parent Government should disgorge its criminals on any shore but this. Can human nature be so base? Look at home. How many English farmers do never secretly wish for rain after their own crop is housed? How many English landlords abstain from supporting the Corn Laws, which, by rendering bread scarce, fill hospitals and gaols? If this fact had been brought before the English nation, if they had been told that they are creating from their own loins a nation of Cyprians and Turks, they might have disposed of their criminals in some other manner. And was it to be expected that the colonists should, as they term it, "cut their own throats," by asking to be deprived of their only means of wealth? If you still want a reason for the silence of colonial writers, remember who they are. Are they not colonists? could you expect them to disparage their country?

For my part, having inherited what is wealth to me, I, though a colonist, have no interest in the maintenance of penal slavery; and I had rather serve, than flatter, my adopted country. If there were a reasonable prospect, or only an even chance, that

the evil would wear itself out, the least knowledge of the world must dictate silence; but will not the future be an aggravation of the present? Recollect what has been said of language and drunkenness; that laws are mere words unless upheld by opinion; and that habit is a second nature. If, again, the evil were incurable, the least share of discretion would command silence; but it is caused solely by an extreme disproportion between the sexes, which has been caused, and is now maintained, by the British legislature! You cannot recall the past; but you must deplore the present, and you may controul the future. A law of your parliament is opposed to the laws of nature—repeal it, and we are saved. If you do not, at least, modify it, so as to give us, with the poison, a partial antidote—that is, fewer men or more women; you will surely (and this is no anti-climax) hear again and again of the intolerable subject.

Meanwhile, if General Murray should be Colonial Minister when you receive this, find your way to his closet. Repeat to him my earnest, though too feeble, complaint. He is a man of business, and will hear you. He is a man of the world, and will understand you. He is a reasonable man, and will not deny that such causes must produce such effects. He is a statesman, and will acknowledge the injustice of inflicting so many curses upon any body of his master's equal subjects. He is a brave man, and will not hesitate to probe the wound. He is a gallant gentleman, and will pity this young race. He is an eloquent man—perhaps he will undertake their cause. He must be capable of generous emotions, or he could not shine as an orator; if in this case, he should give way to the noblest feelings of his heart, millions yet unborn will have to bless his name.

I have done with the dark side of the picture.

POSITION OF AUSTRALASIA

Just before I embarked at Plymouth, I visited my grandmother, *in* order to take leave of her for ever. Poor old soul! she was already dead to the concerns of this life; my departure could make but little difference in the time of our separation, and in regard to her affection for me, it could be of no importance to her which of us should quit the other. My resolution, however, revived for a day all her woman's feelings. She shed abundance of tears, and then became extremely curious to know every particular about the place to which I was going. I rubbed

her spectacles whilst she wiped her eyes, and having placed before her a common English chart of the world, pointed out the situation of New Holland. She shook her head. "What displeases you, my dear Madam?" said I. "Why," she answered, "it is terribly out of the way—down in the very right hand corner of the world." The chart being mine, I cut it in two through the meridian of Iceland, transposed the parts laterally, and turned them upside down. "Now," asked I, "where is England?" "Ah! boy," she replied; "you may do what you like with the map; but you can't twist the world about in that manner, though they *are* making sad changes in it."

Enough of my grandmother.—But, notwithstanding the great increase of knowledge which she deplored, English people generally do consider New Holland "terribly out of the way." Out of the way of what? Of England? Yes; but is every part of the world a pleasant or hateful residence, only according to its facilities of communication with England? Any people, no doubt, must be the better for communication with the most civilized people in the world; but the degree of intercourse between nations is not entirely regulated by distance. Indeed, distance has very little to do with it, as appears by comparing the case of France and Spain, with that of England and India. Perhaps, if there were no restrictions on trade, the greatest difference of temperature, which involves considerable distance, would cause the greatest degree of intercourse, by means of the greatest difference of production, and the greatest motive for exchange. But, however this may be, I suspect that those who despise New Holland on account of its being out of the way of England, would, if they could be forced to think on the subject, acknowledge that they do not mean exactly what they say. Comparing the inhabitants of Pest, for example, with those of Calcutta, they would see that wealth and civilization are not measured by the longitude from Greenwich; and a glance at Loo Choo might convince them, if Captain Hall was not deceived, that happiness does not depend on geographical position with respect to England. But, without inquiry, a moment's reflection would lead them to use other words. They do not mean, though they say so, out of the 'spect to England, but positivol .ed and distant from the res er," as my grandmother sai ears to arise from confusion more distant from England es, the

vulgar suppose that it must also be more distant from those places. Whereas the very contrary is the fact; the distance of those places from England placing them near to New Holland. There is a great difference, in short, between looking to a place and looking *from* it; and my grandmother thought there was no difference. Now the situation of a country is of importance to those who live in it, rather than to those who do not; and the former also will, looking from the country, make the truest estimate of what good or evil may belong to its position with respect to other countries. Call upon your imagination, therefore. Fancy yourself here. And for fear of my grandmother's "down in the corner," look at a globe, or divide a chart of the world, transposing the parts laterally, but without turning them upside down.

Where is England? Up in the left-hand corner.—And New Holland? Let an English writer answer—"In order to obtain a connected view of the loftiest and most extensive system of mountains upon the globe, we must suppose ourselves placed in New Holland with our face turned towards the north. America will then be on the right, Asia and Africa on the left. From Cape Horn to Behring's Strait, along the western coast of America, there is an almost uninterrupted range of the highest mountains; from Behring's Strait again, succeeds an enormous line passing in a south-westerly direction through Asia, leaving China and Hindostan to the south, somewhat interrupted as it approaches Africa, but still to be looked upon as continuing its course in the mountains of Persia and Arabia Felix. From Cape Gardafui, in Africa, to the Cape of Good Hope, there appears to be a chain which completes the view. The series of mountains which we have thus followed, is in the form of *an immense irregular curve*, which comprises within it the Pacific and Indian Oceans, with their innumerable islands, besides a portion of Asia, including China, the Burman dominions and the Indian peninsula." The situation of New Holland with respect to this "immense irregular curve," is like that of the frog of a horse's foot to the outline of the shoe; the most favourable position imaginable for intercourse with all that the curve contains. Remark also, that Australasia has a territorial line of above eight thousand miles, immediately connected by water with those numerous countries, of which, again, nearly all the rivers flow towards a common centre, which is New Holland. Add to this, that those countries comprise not only every degree of latitude, north and south, as far as land extends, but the most

fertile, and, above all, the most populous regions of the earth. Thus it becomes evident that Australasia, instead of being positively "out of the way," offers, all at once, better means and greater motives, for a more frequent intercourse with a greater variety of nations and a larger number of people, than any other country without exception. But what avails this super-excellent position, unless there were civilized men to enjoy it? Let us see whether the country be capable of supporting a numerous population.

CAPACITY OF AUSTRALASIA FOR SUPPORTING A DENSE POPULATION

Our knowledge with a view to this question is very confined. Except of Van Diemen's Land, New South Wales, and a small part of the western coast of Australia, nothing is known but from the reports of shipwrecked sailors or nautical surveyors. Even the latter, when they examine an uninhabited country, have little opportunity, and are seldom in a fit state of mind, to observe usefully for any but nautical purposes. The greatest of them all passed some time close to the noble harbour of Port Jackson without discovering it; and he represented as the best situation for a town on the eastern coast of Australia, what turns out to be one of the worst. Cook, being a great man, was master of his own mind; but how many explorers of unknown regions have had their spirits, either over-excited by novelty and the pride of conquering so many difficulties, or else depressed by long anxiety, the gloom that surrounded them, and the uncertainty of their return to the haunts of men! How many quite ordinary places, in various parts of the world, accordingly, have been described either as Eldorados or Hells upon Earth! All the early explorers of Australasia were of the melancholy class. They told of nothing but horrors—horrid winds, horrid currents, horrid deserts, and more horrid savages. We are not to wonder, therefore, that no attempt was made to form settlements in the country till a hundred and seventy years after its discovery. Later voyagers have expressed themselves little more favourably of the spots at which they touched. The French, in particular, seem to have been almost as much terrified as the Dutch, who, during two previous centuries, could meet with nothing but horrors; and modern English navigators have rather confirmed than contra-

•dieted the gloomy tales of their predecessors. Upon the whole, if we had no other knowledge of this country but what may be gathered from the reports of sailors, we should believe it to be a hell upon earth.

We have, however, some other knowledge. A good portion of Eastern Australia has been thoroughly examined by men whose researches were not confined to the coast, who were glad to find the country thinly peopled, and with whom "plenty of fresh water" was not, as it is with the sailors on desert coasts, a ruling idea. Experience, in a word, has proved New South Wales to be as habitable as any country in the world. Van Diemen's Land also, which was represented by the French as a dreary mass of rocks, a butt to the storms, and a breaker to the waves, of the Southern Ocean, where

winds tumultuous flew;
Forth burst the stormy band with thundering roar,
And heaps on heaps the clouds are tost before;
To the wide main then stooping from the skies,
The heaving deeps in watery mountains rise—

turns out, to those who live there, a very quiet, comfortable island, not less suited to be the abode of man than the most fortunate department of France. Lastly, a part of Western Australia which, by the French again, as well as by the Dutch, Portuguese, Spaniards and English, was described as subject, like Van Diemen's Land, to the most dreadful storms, and as presenting a mass of mere sand-hummocks; having at length been carefully examined by a landsman, appears, as he says, "superior to any land that he ever saw in New South Wales east of the Blue Mountains, not only in its local character, but in the many existing advantages which it holds out to settlers." I do not vouch for the accuracy of Mr. Frazer's report, though I believe that it will be verified by the experiment now in progress. If the emigrants to Cockburn Sound should soon be over-supplied with mere food, (which, without slaves, either black or white, is the utmost that they can expect,) the reports of ages will be falsified in a third instance, and we shall have another motive for judging of the unsettled parts of this country, rather by analogy than by the statements of coast surveyors.

Pursuing the former method, referring to countries of a corresponding latitude in both hemispheres and to what is established beyond a doubt as to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, may we not conclude that Australasia, generally, is capable of supporting a dense population? I do not pretend

to decide the question, and your means of judging are almost equal to mine. Consult your maps and books, therefore, and judge for yourself. I venture, however, to recommend, that whilst studying the subject, and particularly when reading the works that treat of this country, you bear in mind the following considerations:—

1. The line of heat is two or three degrees north of the equator; consequently, our tropic corresponds with a line by so much north of yours.

2. A high temperature and great humidity of *soil* seem to be incompatible with health.

3. Countries having a very dry soil, and reckoned amongst the happiest spots on the globe, receive a greater quantity of rain than some countries where few days pass without rain. In the course of a year, for instance, more rain falls in New South Wales than in England.

4. Most of the European and Asiatic countries lying between the latitudes 25^0 and 45^0 , which correspond with the extra-tropical portion of Australasia, either do actually support, or have supported, a dense population. Though their soil be dry and naturally unfertile, it becomes productive through the skill of man in raising water to the surface, preserving rain water, and distributing both. Great part of Italy, for example, would be unproductive, but for wells, reservoirs, and canals of irrigation; and, in the now desert countries about the Caspian Sea, where the remains of cities abound, ruined wells, tanks, and aqueducts prove that, until the people perished through moral causes, they were preserved by their skill in the management of water.

5. Englishmen being used at home to consider water an enemy, and to exercise much skill in getting rid of it, are ignorant of the means by which, in countries where the sun exerts great power, water becomes the first agent of production. When an Englishman, therefore, laments over the blasting effects of drought in New South Wales, he should be reminded that in Italy, Greece, and Asia Minor, "the dry season" is the season of vegetation. But it is not owing to their ignorance only that Englishmen in New South Wales have neglected the management of water. It is owing, principally, to the scantiness of their number in proportion to the soil at their disposal. Where labourers are scarce, it must be impossible to form reservoirs and aqueducts; and where scarcity of labourers is occasioned by excess of territory, it would, also, be useless to do so.

Why should we exert ourselves to cultivate the sandstone district near Sydney, whilst there is, at a distance, unappropriated land naturally productive? If fifty thousand acres of the now desert land near Sydney could be removed, and attached to the coast of Genoa, they would soon produce rich harvests; but we are not to blame for our neglect of what would be so much prized in Europe. All I wish you to remember is, that, though what has occurred here proves a good deal, it has not by any means proved the utmost capacity of this part of Australasia to support a dense population.

6. Partly from ignorance, and partly from necessity, the cultivators of New South Wales have failed, in another respect, to give their soil a fair trial. They are still bent upon growing English wheat, though experience might have satisfied them that the soil and climate are not agreeable to it. The consequence is that they often complain of bad harvests. Probably, if the Neapolitan territory were depopulated, and given to Englishmen, they would sow wheat rather than maize, and plant gooseberry bushes rather than vines and fig-trees. But time would instruct them; and, if it did but increase their numbers so as to permit the employment of many hands in one field, it would re-establish those productions which, in Italy, maintain a dense population, notwithstanding the curse of bad government. So, in time, though it is impossible to conjecture at what time, the inhabitants of New South Wales will sow and plant with a view to obtain the greatest possible produce from a given space. Then, but not till then, experience and analogy will enable us to estimate with confidence the utmost number of people that the whole country may be capable of supporting. By then, however, the point will be absolutely decided; for no part of this country can become densely, whilst any part shall remain thinly, peopled.

On this interesting question I now leave you to speculate for yourself. Why does not a second Volney migrate to a New America, and furnish to the other worlds a philosophical account of our soil and climate? Europe, at least, would reward his labours. But as it matters little that a country should support many people if they be physically worthless, you must want some account of the influence of our soil and climate on the offspring of British emigrants. This will bring me to the promised chapter upon "Currency Lasses."

CURRENCY LASSES

That low-lived Englishman who, in the pride of his John Bull breed, and of his condition as paymaster to an exiled marching regiment, distinguished the Emigrant from the Native population of New South Wales, by nicknaming the one Sterling, and the other Currency, was, no doubt, a man of taste, according to his station and habits. Colonial money being at the time below par with reference to British money, he intended to depreciate the Native colonists with reference to true-born British colonists; as if, forsooth, there were a pin to choose between colonists, in point of rank. But, probably, he was an admirer of cherry cheeks, purple arms, thick legs, and a nutmeg-grater skin, in the one sex, and of bulk, high cheek-bones, and red whiskers in the other—all characteristic, perhaps, of the regimental paymaster and his tramping wife. If so, no wonder that he should think meanly of the Native Australians. But, if an Englishman of refined taste had been compelled to express his opinion of the two races by terms signifying measures of value, he would, I believe, have given the higher denomination to the Australians, who, as they differ from a vulgar Englishman's idea of perfection, approach to that of Flaxman and Byron.

"Tous les goûts sont dans la nature; celui qu'on a est le meilleur." In English, "everyone to his taste, as the old woman said when she kissed her cow." Nevertheless, in spite of the many proverbs which declare that there is no standard of taste, the same human form which more than two thousand years ago was embodied by Phidias and Praxiteles, is still considered the model of perfection by all refined Europeans. Where does that form most commonly breathe? In Greece, and even in the very Cyprus, where Adonis was conceived, and where the Goddess of Beauty had two temples. You may laugh or sneer; but the latitude of Sydney corresponds exactly with that of Paphos; and it is no less true that the native Australians bear a stronger resemblance to the modern Greeks than to any other people. They have been described as lank, sallow and relaxed, like the Americans; but I have seen the Apollo and the Venus, some thousands of breathing Greeks, and some millions of Americans; and I assert the description to be false. The Australian youth are neither chubby, ruddy, and strongly knit, like the English, whose otherwise variable climate is almost constantly wet; nor fat, white, thick-skinned, and shapeless, like the Dutch, whose climate is one fog, dripping or frozen; nor

indescribable, like the mongrel French, whose climate is neither one thing nor the other; and they are still less like the Americans, whose climate, more variable than that of England, is always in extremes, blowing burning hot and biting cold with the same breath; but they resemble the Castilians, the sea-coast Italians, and more especially the island Greeks, which last enjoy, like them, perpetual summer upon a soil not alluvial.

As to form and mien you shall judge for yourself. The young men of Australia, like Alfieri and Mr. Hope's Modern Greek, are passionately fond of horses. If you would see one of them, look in Flaxman's illustrations of the *Iliad*, at the figure of Diomed returning with the spoils of Rhesus. The Australian girls, like the girls of Genoa, Naples and the Archipelago, are passionately fond of swimming. If you would see a group of them, look at Flaxman's sea nymphs obeying the command of Thetis—

"Ye sister Nereids, to your deeps descend."

But Flaxman's outlines represent only form and mien. How shall I paint the rest? As for the young men, I cannot help feeling envious and jealous of their personal beauty: so I shall not mention it again; and you may fancy what you please, or get a woman of observation to take their picture for you. But the girls—oh! that is quite another thing; and I will write for my own pleasure, whether you read or not. And let me ask, by the by, whether, if the women of a country be generally beautiful, the men, likewise, will not be handsome? Why is the highest class in England better looking than the others? Because, I imagine, it obtains a constant accession of beautiful women;—men of rank having the largest choice, and marrying to please their eyes; whilst young men of wealth, aspiring to rank, marry girls of condition, the daughters of beauty, and of rank, whose mother was beauty. Thus, not only does the highest class pick out the beauties of two or three classes, but it also keeps its own beauties. Supposing you to agree with me that both sexes of the English highest class, do generally **excel** in person both sexes of the other classes, it would seem to follow that if the female colonists, generally, are beautiful, beauty in both sexes will be a colonial attribute. However, infer what you like. Here is the fact.

You remember that Genoese girl before whom you trembled, and I became faint, though she only handed us some grapes. Do you remember that, having recovered ourselves, we measured **her** eyelashes? Do you remember how long they were, and

how she laughed? Do you remember that bright laugh, and how I patted her cheek, and told her that it was softer than her country's velvet? And how she blushed—do you remember that?—to the tips of her fingers and the roots of her hair? And then how——do you remember how, peasant as she was, and but just fifteen, she tossed her head and stamped her little foot, with the air of a Queen? And then how, on a sudden, her large eyes were filled with tears; and the grace with which she folded her arms across that charming bosom; and the tone—I hear it now—the deep, grave, penetrating tone in which, half angry, half afraid, she at once threatened us with her "Berto" and implored our respect? We did not care much for Mr. Berto, certainly; but did we not swear, both together, that not a hair of her head should be hurt? And when, flattered by our involuntary devotion, she departed with a healthy lively step, showing her small smooth ancles, and now and then turning her profile to us, and laughing as before—did we not, dashing blades as we thought ourselves, snuffle and blow our noses, and shake hands without the least motive, like two fools? And afterwards, notwithstanding that gratuitous fit of friendship, did we not feel jealous of each other for three days, though neither of us could hope to see the little angel again?—Yes, you remember it all. Well, just such another girl as that brings fruit to my door every morning.

I do not pretend, however, that *all* the girls of Australia are equally beautiful; but I do declare, what you know to be true of the Ligurian girls, that three out of four of them would be considered beauties in Mayfair. The cause—what is the cause? As you love a reason for everything, I will state my own notion on the subject.

It was after you left me in Italy that I passed a miserable winter at Turin, amongst one of the ugliest races of women in the world. In March, whilst tire plain of the Po was still covered with deep frozen snow, and all things above the snow were enveloped in dense, chilling, choking fog, I removed to Genoa. The old track over the Bochetta, by Gavi, was then the only road across that part of the Appennines; and that track led over the narrow top of the highest ridge, so that three turns of a wheel carried the traveller from the climate of the Baltic, as it were, to that of the Mediterranean. The contrast was most delightful, not to the sight only, but to every one of the senses. Instead of only some yards of snow **and** fog, I beheld, suddenly and at one view, a long range of **moun-**

tain steps clothed with vegetation, partly of the dark evergreen, partly of the bright green of the spring; and, winding through those wooded hills, the narrow vale of Polcevera with its clear stream and brilliant gardens; and, beyond these, Genoa the Magnificent, with her lighthouse, domes and marble palaces, glittering in the sun; and last, the Mediterranean itself, rising, apparently to me who looked down upon it, into a huge bank of blue, which formed the background of the picture. Was not this a sight for eyes just thawed? Instead of a cold, damp, motionless atmosphere, I breathed highly rarefied air, and felt the soft breeze pass over my face. I listened, doubting; but it was true—the music of the chestnut groves had begun. Presently there were violets by the roadside; and at Campo Marone, the first post-house on the sunny side of the Appennines, I received strawberries from a group of girls, with bare arms and necks and fresh flowers in their hair. I was mad with animal joy. Even my English servant (the same who is now an Australian Aristocrat) felt the genial change. Though morosely glum by nature, he played some monkey's tricks, ogling the strawberry girls and pulling the postilion's tails, before my face. And though anything but a beauty, his stubborn features expanded with happiness, which makes every animal comely after its kind. In the very act of admiring him I discovered why the Genoese are as lovely as the Alexandrians are frightful. I knew, before, that Alexandria is placed in a swamp between the Alps and the Appenines; that, consequently, its inhabitants are frozen in winter and stifled in summer; and that at Genoa the air, never very cold or very hot, always circulates freely; and I had imagined that this great difference of soil and climate must cause the great difference of person. But I still wanted to know the process by which soil and climate deform or beautify the human creature; and it was this that I learned by observing the friskiness of my valet. The Alexandrians suffer from their birth many inconveniences, restraints and even torments, which the Genoese escape. They feel, therefore, a greater quantity of pain; or, in other words, the Genoese enjoy more happiness. If the face is the mirror of the mind, the whole form may be an index of the habits. Happiness includes animal liberty, and misery includes restraint. Whatever the human variety, a face of joy and a form of ease make the perfection of beauty; whilst general deformity is the type of suffering and constraint. As we feel and act continually, so shall we appear. Thus, after all, soil and climate may produce beauty or ugliness by a moral

rather than a physical process. What think you of my invention? Apply it to the Australian girls. If you should find in it a reason for their loveliness, I shall not have digressed. Would that all men might adopt the theory; as, in that case, every admirer of beauty must be a warm philanthropist! The first division of the theory, however, is not new, but very old. The supposed influence of soil and climate on happiness, without reference to beauty, gave a name to the Fortunate Isles. Why should not this ill-named part of Australasia be called Australia Felix?

Allowing that soil and climate produce beauty by means of happiness, still the character must, in a great measure, depend on original causes strictly moral. The disposition of a people will be governed by their condition; and their condition again will, in most cases, be ordered by their laws. This Colonial Government, though necessarily bad, is far superior both to the late oligarchy of Genoa and to the actual despotism of Carlo Feroce. In one most essential point, it is greatly superior to the government of Britain. Able to increase its territory according to the increase of its people, it avails itself of that mighty advantage; and thus, by the most gentle laws, forbids the existence of Want. If to do what is here so easy deserve the least praise, how might the government of Britain be blessed for finding means to do what, there, would be so large a good! But let us proceed. The Australian youth suffer none of the evils of poverty. It follows that what may be called their natural character is excellent. The young men are gay, high-spirited, impetuous; brave even to a fault; that is, wanting in discretion; yet at times, when with their parents, gentle and affectionate—when with their mistresses, tender and passionately amorous. The girls are lively, imaginative, enthusiastic, and very—very loving; yet, until hunted down, as before stated, modest as girls can be. Both sexes have a strong capacity for knowledge; and I observe in them a certain natural refinement of mind, like that which distinguishes a Greek Feasant from a Dutch Mightiness. In short, they resemble the modern Greeks, mentally as well as bodily. A Triple Alliance offers to Greeks the means of exerting their capacity for all that is great and good. Shall British laws forbid this young race of British Subjects to eschew evil and cultivate good—to escape from that moral debasement which, wherever it occurs, is due rather to bad laws than to the nature of things? Answer that question, proud Englishman!

Having answered it, you may laugh at my admiration of these

despised colonists; and you may, if you like, sneer at my enthusiasm in their cause. But I have written as I believe and feel; I do admire and love them; and I hope to live and die amongst them, besides serving them, to the best of my poor ability.

I will continue, nevertheless, to scribble with the impartiality of a cosmopolite. It is true that many of the native Australians lose their teeth at an early age. This is an ill truly American; and it is produced in both countries, I believe, by the very same cause or causes. Volney, a man of taste as well as of deep research, was educated for the practice of physic. Being most kindly disposed towards the Americans, and shocked at the state of their mouths, he gave himself the trouble to inquire, and to tell them, not only why their teeth decayed so early, but also how that sickening evil might be avoided by future generations. He showed that the disease is not strictly endemial, but that it arises from the excessive use of animal food and strong drinks, in a climate not adapted to such gross sustenance. His view of the subject is founded, in part, upon a survey of human habits from the Equator to the North Pole. The nearer people live to the sun, the less animal food, and the less animal fat especially, do they consume. The Esquimaux, who live as far as possible from the sun, breakfast, dine and sup upon bears'-grease and blubber; whilst the northern nations are remarkable for their love of strong spirituous drinks, and for the impunity with which they swallow enormous quantities of them. To gormandise flesh and to guzzle strong drinks is the mark of an Englishman all over the world. These habits are not destructive to the teeth of English people; but the descendants of English people in America lose their teeth. The descendants of Spaniards and Portuguese in America, who are temperate in eating and drinking, do not lose their teeth. Hence, it is inferred that the English Americans owe the loss of their teeth to the intemperance which they have inherited from their ancestors and ours.

So far Volney. But gormandising and guzzling are habitual only to certain low classes of English people—to every class below, and including the highest that delights in goose, sausages and pork chops. Why did the Americans adopt, and why have they preserved, these baser English appetites, rather than those which, now at least, belong to the upper classes in England? Because emigrants to new countries are of the gormandising and guzzling classes; and because, in new countries, tastes **and** habits, as well as modes and manners, must necessarily proceed

from the lowest class. The Americans scorned the friendly suggestions of Volney; as now, they glory in some of their worst defects, like the beast who, being reproached with the dirty state of his hands, said, "Dirty—oh! you call that dirty, do you? I wish you could see my feet." But what else could be expected? It is not as to their teeth only that the American people, as has been said of Russian Nobles, become rotten before they are ripe; and by such a people advice will always be received with scorn unless it happen to flatter their prejudices, in which case, though of course the advice of an enemy, it will be implicitly followed.

So it is here, only, I mean, as to the decay of teeth; for at present this is not a people, but merely a colony of low-bred English. I attribute the loss of teeth which disfigures so many of the colonial youth, entirely to their low English habits of eating and drinking. Some of them have adopted habits more suitable to the climate; and these have generally beautiful teeth. Amongst them is the girl before mentioned. She has sound, strong, white, separate teeth, like those of a young dog fed upon oatmeal; and her breath is sweet as that of a sucking donkey. Feeling deeply upon this subject, I have taken pains to ascertain what has been the ordinary food of those young people who are remarkable for very good or very bad teeth, and the result of my inquiries is a conviction that gross English feeding under a Neapolitan sun, if steadily pursued from infancy to puberty, will spoil nine mouths out of ten. I also believe, of course, that this, the worst Americanism that has as yet crept into the colony, may be eradicated. If you come here, you will, I trust, join me in a crusade against gormandising and guzzling. What think you of sending to Naples for a dozen foundling children; six of whom we might feed *on* vermicelli, polenta, fruits and water; and six upon melted butter, lard, dripping, suet, fat mutton, roast pork, ducks, geese, pork sausages, hams and bacon; with ale, porter, stout, brandy, rum, gin, hollands, whiskey, shrub, and other cordial compounds of essential oil? The experiment would probably be conclusive of the question; and in that case, though somewhat cruel apparently, it would, in truth, be a large humanity. I know not how we could invest a little money more for our children's advantage. But do not imagine that I have a greater affection **for** those colonists who have good teeth than for those who have none. When on ship board with women, we pity those who suffer more than those who escape; and pity is akin to love.

My determination to tell you the whole truth has compelled me to speak evil of the Australians after I had, as I thought just now, finished the dark side of their picture. At length you have both sides of it, and I shall describe no more. But my residence in this miserable place has compelled me to think, for want of something else to do. Of course I have thought principally of this place and this people; and it was but natural that I should, in theory at least, search after means for improving the place and mending the people. Whether it be possible to do so, is a question that I do not pretend to decide; but here follow my humble reflections on the subject. If you should think them worthy of the least attention, make what use of them you please. If not, throw the remainder of this letter into the fire.

A NEW PEOPLE

What are the ideas that we mean to express by the words a *New People*? Do we mean simply a people little advanced in civilization? Certainly not; as we do not apply the term either to the Russians, or the Turks, or the Irish, or even to the Hottentots. Do we mean any body of people that emigrates from an old country and settles permanently at a distance from it? Certainly not; or the Portuguese inhabitants of Goa, and the Dutch settlers in Java, would have been called a new people, which they never were called; and the English who will settle in Hindostan, as soon as the India Company's Charter shall expire, would be called a new people, which they never will be called. Do we mean a people who remove from cultivated to uncultivated regions, and settle permanently in the latter? Certainly not; or the inhabitants of Petersburg and Odessa would be called new people. Do we mean a people who migrate from an old country and settle permanently elsewhere, forming from the day of their settlement an independent State? Certainly not; for all that we know of the wealthy, accomplished and refined founders of Syracuse, Agrigentum and Ephesus, is quite at variance with what is now meant by a new people. What then do we mean? We mean, it strikes me, a people like what the Canadians will be, and the United States' Americans are—a people who, though they continually increase in number, make no progress in the art of living; who, in respect to wealth, knowledge, skill, taste, and whatever belongs to civilization, have degenerated from their ancestors; who are precluded from

acquiring wealth except by the labour of slaves; whose education, though universal, stops before the age of puberty, and thus becomes, if not an evil, at least a dangerous thing, instead of the greatest good; who, ever on the move, are unable to bring anything to perfection; whose opinions are only violent and false prejudices, the necessary fruit of ignorance; whose character is a compound of vanity, bigotry, obstinacy, and hatred most comprehensive, including whatever does not meet their own pinched notions of right; and who delight in a forced equality, not equality before the law only, but equality against nature and truth; an equality which, to keep the balance always even, rewards the mean rather than the great, and gives more honour to the vile than to the noble. We mean such a people as would despise the memory of a Washington, and quote his elsewhere honoured name only to justify the keeping of slaves. We mean such people as would invent and cherish an American Tariff, a second Spanish Code of the Indies immediately after the Council of the Indies had been virtually dissolved for ever, and after a Vansittart had been reasoned down, in the mother tongue of America, by a Smith, a Malthus, a Ricardo, a Mill, and a M'Culloch. We mean, in two words, a people who become rotten before they are ripe.

It follows that we do not say what we mean. By the word new, we do not express newness either as to settlement or as to independence; for, according to our sense of the word, the Canadians will probably be a newer people fifty years hence than they were fifty years ago, and the United States' Americans are a newer people now, in 1829, than they were in 1779. We mean, then, something quite independent of time and of connection with a mother country. What can it be? Something not plainly attributable either to the Russians at large, or the Turks, or the Irish, or the Hottentots, or to the Portuguese Indians, or to the Dutch Javans, or to the future Anglo-Indians, or to the inhabitants of Petersburg and Odessa, or to the ancient Greek colonies. What can it be? It must be something peculiar to those whom we call new people—to the Americans, Canadians, South Africans and Australasians. And what is that something but an excess of territory in proportion to inhabitants?

That this is what we do mean will become more apparent by reference to the change that has taken place in the condition of the Spanish Mexicans since their independence. Considering that whilst dependent they laboured under many terrible evils,

such as the Code of the Indies and a powerful established superstition, their progress towards a ripe state of civilization (as described by Humboldt) was superior to that of the Anglo-Americans at the same period. For two reasons they could not spread so easily as the North Americans: first, because the Mexican Indians are less easily displaced than those of British America; and secondly, because the Spanish Government discouraged agriculture, and threw many obstacles in the way of gaining a property in waste land. Hence, though the Mexican territory was in fact enormous in proportion to the people, still that disproportion did not operate to its fullest extent, and the Spanish Mexicans enjoyed, politically, a proportion between people and territory something like that of old countries. By their independence they have escaped civil, religious and commercial bondage, but they have acquired the power to spread at will. Does not their present Tartar state seem to decide the question?

But this question is too important to be settled by me. Though it appear to regard only the meaning of a word, it cannot be decided without stating why half the world is in a barbarous condition. Let us, therefore, consult authority. From every book that treats of what we call "new countries/" it would be easy to quote numerous passages illustrating my view of the subject. I have selected five; and the names of their authors will secure your attention.

First, Adam Smith, in quoting whom I take the bull by its very horns; for he argues in favour of excess of territory. In his "Inquiry into the Causes of the Prosperity of New Colonies/" he writes—

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. The colonists carry out with them a knowledge of agriculture and of other useful arts, superior to what can grow up of its own accord in the course of many centuries among 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. But 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 fed, and properly taken care of; and when they are grown up, the value of their labour greatly over-pays 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 inferior 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 always 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 the 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 consist 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 ancient 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. Though posterior in their establishment, yet all the arts of refinement, philosophy, poetry, and eloquence, seem to have been cultivated as early, and to have been improved as highly, in them, as in any part of the

mother country. All those Colonies had established themselves in countries inhabited by savage and barbarous nations, who easily gave place to the new settlers. They had plenty of good land, and as they were altogether independent of the mother city, they were at liberty to manage their own affairs in the way that they judged was most suitable to their own interests.

In the above passage, of which the object is to account for the very rapid acquisition of wealth by emigrants from the states of Greece, five main causes are stated—knowledge of agriculture and other useful arts; freedom from taxes; independence from the beginning; cheapness of land; and dearness of labour. But the statement, when examined, will appear very objectionable, both in fact and in reasoning. The Emigrants from Greece did *not* obtain immense tracts of waste land, over which they and their children might spread at will. There is not, I believe, an instance of their having advanced far into the interior of any country. Wherever they landed they had to displace warlike tribes, who, abandoning the sea coast after a struggle, continued to watch the intruders and to confine them within very narrow limits. The first occupation of a Greek Colony seems to have been to erect a fortress, into which the whole body of colonists might retire in case of need. Some of these strong places became, in a very short time, splendid cities; but the quantity of land required to maintain the inhabitants of one great city, 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, were not a cause of the rapid prosperity of the Greek Colonies. In the next place, high wages—dearness of labour—assuredly had no part in their rapid advancement. For, besides that high wages could have arisen, only in the manner so well described by Dr. Smith, from superabundance of land, the Colonists carried with them, and obtained after their settlement, numbers of slaves, who were their principal, if not their sole, cultivators and artisans! Lastly, it may be denied that the complete independence of a Colony from the beginning is by any means advantageous; for, however ill dependent Colonies have been governed after they had arrived at some importance, they have generally received nothing, in their first beginnings, but protection and assistance from the parent States under whose dominion they remained.

If these objections to the facts and reasoning of Dr. Smith are not unfounded, but two out of the five causes assigned by him can be admitted—knowledge of agriculture and other useful

arts, and freedom from taxes. These, by themselves, are surely quite inadequate to the effects for which he endeavours to account. May not other causes be assigned?—I imagine four:—

First—The constitution of the emigrating body. The leaders of bodies of emigrants from Greece were men of the highest distinction, whose fame, ability and wealth enabled them to collect and transport a great number of followers, drawn from all ranks in the old State. Thus a body of Colonists formed, not a new society, in the common acceptance of the term, but an old society that had changed its abode. Secondly—The new abode was *not* an immense waste, without inhabitants, over which the colonists might spread themselves, remaining for ages a scattered people, without that concentration in anything, which in almost every thing is the essence of power. Thirdly—The narrow limits of territory in proportion to people, together with the institution of slavery, rendered labour cheap instead of dear. Hence the profits of stock, to use a modern term, were large; wealth rapidly accumulated; and it was easy for the new society to erect fine buildings—to create very rapidly a city rivalling their parent city. Fourthly—As the portion of produce which falls to the landowner—in modern language, rent—is small or great, according as people are few or many in proportion to territory, and as the leaders of the new society were the owners of a limited territory, they possessed, either at once or very soon, the riches and the consequent leisure wherewith to cultivate "all the arts of refinement, philosophy, poetry and eloquence/"

In the same chapter Dr. Smith endeavours to account for the less rapid progress of the American Colonies, in comparison with those of Greece, by dwelling on the evils of dependence; and he frequently repeats that settlers in America were enabled to prosper, in spite of dependence, by reason of their excess of territory in proportion to the people; which advantage, he says, they possess in a greater degree than emigrants from Greece.

This doctrine may be submitted to the test of facts. The United States of North America have for some time enjoyed complete independence. Their inhabitants pay no tithes and but few taxes. Land may still be obtained almost as easily, and labour is still quite as dear, as when those States were founded. Their population equals, probably, that of Great Britain and Ireland at the time when Dr. Smith wrote. A constant influx of emigrants from Europe, the press, and great improvements in navigation, have placed at their disposal the

accumulated, and always increasing knowledge of the old world. Their soil is naturally fertile, and their climate is more favourable to varied production than that of Britain. Their mineral productions are little inferior to those of Britain. Their magnificent rivers afford natural means of communication infinitely superior to those of any European State; and the people are hardy, brave, active, intelligent, enterprising and extremely ambitious. According to Dr. Smith, therefore, they ought by this time to have rivalled at least, if not to have surpassed, their parent state in wealth and greatness. Yet look at their condition. Their metropolis is not to be compared to many of the mere pleasure-towns of England. Want of capital prevented the State of New York from commencing its great Canal from Lake Erie until long after the profit of that undertaking had been demonstrated; and other States are now attempting to raise money in London for great works, which cannot be undertaken unless capital be obtained from the parent country. In the useful arts/excepting only, perhaps, that of steam-navigation, they are far behind the parent country. Their manufactures, miserable at best, exist only through restrictive laws. If in the fine arts there arise amongst them a man of ability, he hastens to Europe for patronage and profit. Their best writers live in France and England, because America offers no rewards for success in literature. Their cleverest mechanics bring their skill to the rich market of Europe, because in America skill is less valuable than strength. Their boasted naval power is held as a mere boast by those who know that they are positively unable to man as many ships as constitute a fleet; and all the arts of refinement, philosophy, poetry and eloquence are more largely and successfully cultivated in the narrow space that is covered by the sea-port town of Liverpool, than throughout the extensive regions of North America. Thus the doctrine of Adam Smith concerning the effect of cheap land and dear labour, in producing national wealth and greatness, has been refuted by the safest of all arguments—an ample experiment. Doubtless the people of America are laying a most extensive foundation of future wealth and greatness—of a national greatness surpassing any that has occurred in the world. They are spreading over such extensive regions that, if they do but preserve their integrity, they must, whenever they cease to spread, acquire an unexampled degree of national wealth and power. But at present, and until they can no longer spread, they are, and must remain—like children acquiring the means

of knowledge by learning to read—an infant people, acquiring only the means of future wealth and greatness.

Secondly. Washington, writing to Arthur Young, says,

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

Land is not the only thing which, for the reasons given by Washington, the Americans have only scratched instead of cultivating.

Thirdly. Humboldt, describing the province of Vera Cruz, says,

A small number of powerful families, who live on the central table land, possess the greatest part of the shores of the intendencies of Vera Cruz and San Luis Potosi. No Agrarian law forces these rich proprietors to sell their Mayorazzos, if they persist in refusing to bring their immense territories under cultivation.

In this case, good seems to have come of evil. The Spanish government granted away the shores of Vera Cruz and San Luis Potosi in a manner tantamount to the annihilation of those fertile districts, and there were wealthy persons on the table land. But if the shores of the Mexican Gulf had been scratched, would the Mexican table land have been well cultivated? The ghost of Washington would say, No. If in all things but barbarism you prefer scratching to cultivating, read no more. What says a spirit akin to that of Washington?

Fourthly. The Abbe Raynal:

Louisiana would not, probably, have languished for so long a time, had it not been for an original error adopted *in granting lands indiscriminately to every person who applied for them, and in the manner in which he desired them*. 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. As population increased, the lands would have been cleared to a greater extent. Instead of a few hordes of [French] savages, we should have seen a rising colony, which might in time have become a powerful nation, and procured infinite advantages to France.

Fifthly. A writer in *The Edinburgh Review* (No. 92):

We have never heard it surmised that a gradual change from slavery to freedom has been a disadvantage to any country, or to

any individual; and it is impossible that it should be so, if that change follows in the natural course of things. We have next to consider what would have promoted, or what has retarded, this change, and why this natural course of things [the gradual extinction of slavery by means of free labour] has made so little progress in the British colonies, or in the United States of America. In the United States, it is certain that the increase of the slave population has been in operation, and would have made men cheap and land dear long before this time, *if they had not been prevented by the boundless extent of new and fertile land.* Thus, when the soils of Virginia had become exhausted by slave cultivation, (for when men do the work of cattle, and use little animal food, fertility is not kept up by green crops, and the soils invariably deteriorate,) then the Virginians became breeders of slaves for sale, and the new and fertile lands in the South Western States found them an extensive market. In our West India Islands, again, land capable of cultivation is in limited extent: and if the slaves in them had increased as in the United States, and the inter-colonial slave-trade had always been illegal, or had been effectually prevented, the operation of natural causes must long since have converted the slaves in most of the islands into free men. What *the boundless extent of fertile land* has done to maintain slavery in the United States, bounties and prohibitory protections have done in the British colonies. For it is just the same thing, whether a bad system is supported by the abundant productions of a fertile soil, or by raising the price of the smaller produce, by bounties and protections.

You are now requested to exert your imagination, and to suppose that, by some convulsion of nature, or by a law of Congress, the North Americans were deprived of their "boundless extent of fertile land." Can it be doubted that, in that case, they would soon be able to escape all the evils of a new, and to enjoy all the advantages of an old, people? Would not they be obliged to concentrate themselves? Would not labour become plentiful and cheap? Would not many people accumulate wealth, and many more cultivate knowledge, with a view to wealth? Would not slavery be gradually abolished, and without loss to the slave-owners; as the diminished value of slaves and the increased value of land, would measure each other? Reminding you, in order to save repetition, of my Tasmanian dream, might not all those great things which are foretold of America happen within the time of living men? If you answer these questions in the affirmative, then you must acknowledge that, by the words, a "new people/" we mean a people who, whether new or old, dependent or independent, have a capacity for greatness, and yet remain insignificant, solely in consequence of their excessive territory. Supposing **this** point established, there arises a question which appears

to me as important as any that can occupy the minds of reflecting men. It is—whether it be possible to devise a faultless cure for this sort of newness where it already exists, and a preventative of it as to future settlements in waste countries?

CURE AND PREVENTATIVE OF NEWNESS

Does not our inquiry into the causes of the evil point not a remedy? In all new countries the government alone has the power to dispose of waste land. Not that a Government would, any where, prevent the cultivation of mere waste; but nobody would cultivate without a title; the government alone can give a secure title; and it is, therefore, impossible to use waste land without the active assistance of government. Does it not follow that the government might, by restricting the amount of grants, establish and maintain the most desirable proportion between people and territory? The answer appears to me so clear and unquestionable, that I will not detain you by any argument concerning it. The proportion between people and territory does, in new countries, depend altogether upon the will of the government. Every new government, therefore, possesses the power to civilize its subjects.

RESTRICTION

But supposing the will to exist, in addition to the power, what would be the proper amount of restriction? An insufficient restriction would be but a partial good, and an excessive restriction would produce, more or less, those terrible evils which, in some old countries, arise from an excess of people in proportion to territory. Where are we to find the just medium? The answer appears to me to be plain and satisfactory. As a wise man eats just as much as will keep him in the best health, but no more: so a wise government would grant just enough land to enable the people to exert their utmost capacity for doubling themselves, but no more. It is needless to enlarge upon this mere truism. But the wisest government must have to invent some rule, by which to measure out the due increase of land according to the increase of people; for it is not enough to say that the land ought to be doubled in quantity, as often as the people should double in number. As the people would increase gradually, so must the quantity of land be augmented by degrees. How, then, might the gradual increase

of land be so regulated as to be neither inadequate nor excessive? By, it appears to me, requiring a payment in money for the title to waste land, that is, by selling grants of land, instead of bestowing them gratis,—instead of persuading people to accept of them. But this is the practice of the American Government, whose subjects are, nevertheless, as "new" as possible. True, and what is the inference, but that the price which the American Government requires for waste land is too low for the only purpose that calls for any price at all? Now let us suppose that the American Government should require nine pounds, instead of only nine shillings, per acre for waste land. There would be no buyers, you think. Of course not, until the people had increased so as to render land, already appropriated, worth more than nine pounds per acre; but then, as surely, there would be buyers at the lower price. What would happen in the meanwhile? Why, the very thing of which we are in search—a desirable proportion between territory and people. Thus it becomes clear, that the object in view may be attained by fixing some considerable price on waste land. Still, how is the proper price to be ascertained? I frankly confess that I do not know. I believe that it could be determined only by experience; but this I do know—that if nine farthings per acre should check the natural increase of people, by causing a scarcity of well-paid employment, it would be too much; and that, if ninety pounds per acre should not promote the greatest increase of wealth and civilization, by maintaining a constant supply of the demand for well-paid labour, it would be too little.

If Johanna Southcote were to rise again, she and one Mr. Sadler (whose Irish rhapsody is more amusing to me than Win Jenkins's letters in *Humphry Clinker*) would exclaim—"What, ask a high price for land where land is worth nothing at all! How unjust in the name of humanity, and false in the name of God!" In answer to these profound exclamations, I would observe, that if your government should discover a mine of pure *£*old just under the turf of Hyde Park, and if the quantity did not exceed a million of ounces, the godsend would pay off near four millions of the national debt; but that, if the quantity of gold so found were ten thousand millions of pounds, none of it would be worth lifting from the earth. If, in short, gold were as plentiful and as easily obtained as water, no one would buy gold, and no one would invest capital in the working of gold mines. But let us suppose that government, discovering ten thousand millions of pounds of gold, should have the power

and the **will** to dole it out gradually, supplying every year to the public **a** quantity equal to what had been lost by wear and accidents during the previous year. In that case the mine might, in time, pay off the whole national debt; that is to say, the government might every year sell a certain quantity of gold at the present mint price. So in the case of waste land in new countries, new governments might, by measuring the quantity according to the demand, sell that quantity for a considerable price; but as Mrs. Southcote has not risen again, and it is a mere waste of time to reason with men like her, let us proceed.

FREE MIGRATION

I beg now for another effort of your imagination. Suppose that the American Government had fixed nine pounds per acre as the price of waste land, and that, consequently, during many years no waste land had been purchased; but that the people had increased so as to raise the price of appropriated land above nine pounds per acre, and that "the pressure of population" upon territory had occasioned a brisk demand for waste land at the government price. All this, as it might surely happen, may be easily conceived. In this case the American Government would every year obtain a large sum of money, the produce of the more divided labour of its less scattered people. What would it do with this money? Pay off the national debt! Good; but from the moment that there had occurred a demand for land at the government price, that demand would, by means of the constant increase of people, continue incessantly, till all the waste land of America should be sold. That economical government, therefore, having paid off its national debt, would still feel the embarrassment of riches. Let us suppose that, not content with an increase of American-born subjects, at the rate of doubling in twenty-five years, and **a** similar geometrical spread of cultivation, it should employ its surplus wealth in obtaining a foreign addition to the population. Let us suppose that it should provide a free passage from **all** over-peopled countries to America, for all who might be tempted to exchange starvation wages for those ample wages which, it is taken for granted, would still prevail in America. What! all who should arrive? If every poor English and Irish family could obtain a passage to America, millions upon millions might emigrate, and the American government might not be **able to**

fulfil its engagement with those poor people. Its funds might be exhausted, and it might be unable to pay the ship-owners for bringing the emigrants. Not so, I think. The sole motive for emigration from Britain would be the higher rate of wages in America. If, therefore, the emigrants should press too hard upon the accumulation of American capital, wages would not be high, but low; and immigration would cease until a fresh demand for labour should arise. And this seems quite clear—that the more British paupers should labour and rear children in America, the greater would be the amount of American wealth, of the demand for waste land, and of the funds to provide for further immigration.

What think you of the scheme? I trust, at least, that it will set you a thinking. But it contains one manifest flaw. Great part of the good to America, and all the good to Britain, that its adoption in practice might bestow, must be deferred until the domestic population of America should attain such a proportion to the land already granted, as would raise the average price of land above nine pounds per acre. So immense is the actual disproportion between people and granted land, that very many years must elapse before its removal by the increase of native Americans. These would be years of hope deferred. Would it be possible to skip over them and to seize all the good at once? I humbly think it would.

ANTICIPATION

Mr. Ricardo's theory of rent is perfectly unquestionable as far as it goes. But it does not, as I imagine, go far enough to explain the nature of rent in new countries. In England the most fertile land, be it where it may, will let for what is called a high rent: here the most fertile land will not, unless near a town, yield any rent at all. But, even in England, fertility is not the sole criterion of rent; as land near a town will let for more than equally fertile land situated far from any town. Again, even in England, land which is in high artificial condition, and is provided with superior farm buildings, will let for considerably more than land of equal natural fertility which has been neglected, and is without the necessary buildings. All I mean by this is, that in speaking of rent according to Mr. Ricardo's theory, we are not to attribute to natural fertility *only*, what is, in fact, *partly* due to situation and to the outlay

of capital. In England, that part of the rent which is paid for superior natural fertility only is generally so large, in proportion to what is paid for situation and the use of fixed capital, that it may not be worth while to distinguish them with hair-splitting precision. But here, that is, in all new countries, the case is quite different. Wherever the most fertile land can be obtained for nothing, the superior fertility of land is worth nothing; and whatever is obtained under the name of rent, is paid *solely* either for vicinity to markets or as interest of fixed capital. Now the supposed restriction on the appropriation of waste land would, as before stated, gradually raise the average price of appropriated land above nine pounds per acre. In other words, it would gradually cause appropriated land to yield a rent in the sense of Mr. Ricardo; it would gradually create an average rent of (we may suppose with reference to the supposed market value) seven or eight shillings per acre, over and above what might be paid for situation and the use of fixed capital. This would be an enormous benefit conferred upon the American landlords. They would, of course, wish to enjoy such a benefit as soon as possible. Might they not greatly hasten its arrival, by engaging to abandon a portion of it, that is, by submitting to a *tax upon rent*, and employing the proceeds of the tax in defraying the cost of foreign immigration? Still, how could that be taxed which does not yet exist? Answer: first, from the moment of restriction on grants, appropriated land would begin to yield some rent, which would increase every year without any foreign addition to the population; and if a portion of that rent were employed *in* promoting foreign immigration, the increase of rent would proceed more rapidly. Secondly, the produce of the tax (the tax being so much per cent, upon the rent actual and future) would increase with the increase of rent. Consequently it might be anticipated, just as now the American Government could readily anticipate the taxes of customs and excise. Indeed, we may suppose that it would be more readily anticipated than those taxes; for though all governments profess to employ the proceeds of loans for the good of the country, that is for increasing the security of the lender, still loans are often unproductive of advantage to any but those who spend them, and sometimes mischievous to all other persons; whereas, in the supposed case, the money raised on the security of a future tax must necessarily and immediately be employed in raising the value of security, that is, in augmenting the number of people and increasing the amount of

rent. If, however, this excellent security should not prove sufficiently tempting to capitalists, the government might add to it the future proceeds of sales of land, the amount of which would be increased by every loan, exactly as in the case of rent. Supposing both rent-tax and the proceeds of sales to be thus mortgaged, the power of anticipation would be used to the utmost, and the final object, the great good in view, would be attained at a period proportionably early.

Apply this theory of Restriction, Anticipation and Free Migration to the case of Britain and her colonies in South Africa and Australasia. Here, in the South, are boundless regions wanting people; there, in the North, are countless people wanting land. Would not this system of colonization be, in effect, a bridge, without toll as to the poor, from Britain to Australasia, touching at the Cape of Good Hope? Remember always that the greater the number of emigrants from Britain the greater would be the demand for land at a money price, and the greater, consequently, would be the means of further emigration. But I must not repeat myself too often. Let us forget, for a moment, the astonishing effects of such a system of colonization upon the colonized countries, and turn to its probable effects on your over-peopled country.

EXTENSION OF BRITAIN

If an Englishman who ardently desires the greatest good of his country—Mr. Wilmot Horton, for instance—were offered the gratification of one wish, however extravagant, for what would he ask? For an immense gold mine? For the destruction of his natural enemies, the French? For an earthquake to swallow up troublesome Ireland? Oh no!—for none of these would he ask. If his character were more remarkable for justice than humanity, he might, perhaps, be tempted to wish for a straightforward Catholic Relief Bill; but, on the whole, he would, I think, wish for the power to increase the territory of Britain according to the wants of the people. And, in making this choice of blessings, he would not be actuated by any ambitious views with reference to the territorial extent of his country. His sole object would be to put an end to that portion of crime and misery which in Britain is produced by an excess of people in proportion to territory; and he would not care, therefore, whether the increase of territory, having that

effect, should take place near to or at a distance from Britain. Behold, I say to men of that class — behold your wish accomplished! Do you doubt the possibility of so great a good? Let me try to persuade you that it is within your reach.

Suppose that you had the power to remove any portion of the waste land of South Africa or Australasia, and attach it to the coast of Britain. If you were to exercise that power rashly, and at once to quadruple the territory of Britain, what would be the consequence? Whatever crime and misery arise from want of employment would cease; but would not rent cease also? Would not wealth and civilization perish? Would not Britain, old as she is, become suddenly a new country? All this assuredly would happen. How, then, would you exercise your power? Prudently, no doubt, with a view to cure the evils of excess of people, without producing the evils of excess of territory. Let us suppose that you should begin by removing only 100,000 acres of good land, bearing fine timber, and fix them on the coast of Lancashire. They would be the property of the Crown. The Crown, probably, would not give them away. It would sell them to the highest bidder. They would sell for perhaps £10, or £20 per acre, according to their natural fertility. Why would they fetch such a price? Because, becoming part of a densely peopled country, they would yield a rent proportionate to that market value. In this supposed case, the Crown would do what it liked with the purchase money. But, in the proposed case, the purchase money of additional territory would be employed in increasing the colonial population—that is to say, in giving to the land purchased a value like that of land removed miraculously to the coast of Lancashire. Whether you remove the land to the people, or the people to the land, makes no difference as to your sole object. Bearing in mind that the greater the amount of emigration to the colonies, the more rapid would be the increase of colonial capital, and the greater would be the demand for more land and more labour—that is, for more emigrants, and of the means of obtaining them—this system of restriction, anticipation and free migration, does offer you the accomplishment of your wish. The good, therefore, is not the less attainable, because it would be very great. Nevertheless, this stupendous good must have a limit as to its duration. Of course it must; because the world is of limited extent. But even if a system of free migration were adopted in all new countries, so as to permit the population of the world to exert its utmost capacity

of increase, still half a century must elapse before the pressure of population upon territory would be felt, at the same moment, all over the world; and perhaps in the course of fifty years we might discover a way to "new countries" in the moon, or, what appears quite as difficult, a means of checking population otherwise than by sin and sorrow.

Meanwhile, though we should always acknowledge our obligations to Mr. Malthus, for having told us what we had not even guessed till he wrote—namely, the precise reasons why some men are, and ever must be, richer than others; still we might avoid, for a time, the worst evils of which that eminent philosopher discovered the causes. This, though but a temporary gain, is worth the greatest efforts; and Britain might enjoy that good for a longer period than any other country, because she already possesses the largest extent of waste land, and she might, perhaps, acquire an exclusive property in more.

As to the immediate operation of this system, one point only remains to be noticed. Perhaps the capital of all new countries, put together, is not at present sufficient to afford ample employment to all the labourers who might be disposed to emigrate from Britain. If the population of Britain were not at once reduced sufficiently to put an end to pauperism arising from want of employment, they might "fill up the vacuum" created by the emigration of an insufficient number, and might still press hard upon the distant demand for labour. To check this too rapid increase of people *in Britain*, it would be advisable to select as emigrants young persons only, and especially young couples of both sexes. The Domestic power of increase would thereby be greatly weakened, and the Colonial power of increase would be strengthened in the same degree. The object is, to reduce, as much as the system would allow, the population of the emigrating country, and to increase, as much as possible, that of the immigrating countries. The propriety of such a selection is, therefore, evident. But there are additional reasons for it. First, it would prevent, altogether, the evils which, here especially, and more or less in all modern new colonies, have arisen from the disproportion between the sexes. Secondly, young men would be more willing than old ones to make the venture of emigration; and both young men and young women would prefer crossing the world in couples, to migrating singly only across the Channel. Thirdly, young persons of both sexes would most readily accommodate their habits to a new climate, and embrace new modes of cultivation and general labour.

Lastly, having families to rear, they would be more industrious than older persons, and probably more apt to save a part of their earnings; whereby they would promote a more rapid increase of colonial capital—of the demand for more land and more labour—of the demand for more young couples, and of the means for obtaining them. In a word, they would make the best members of a new society.

The colonies, however, would no longer be new societies, strictly speaking. They would be so many *extensions* of an old society. Pursue that idea, and you will see that emigration from Britain would not be confined to Paupers, passing by the free bridge. We (I speak in the name of the colonists) should acquire wealth rapidly. Such of us as are landowners must have good incomes, without trouble; for remember that, though the tax upon rent would take something from us, it would only take a part of what it would first bestow! How many ready-made articles, both useful and ornamental, should we import from England, for which, now, we have not the means to pay? Let me enumerate a few of them—farming bailiffs, surveyors, builders, architects and engineers; mineralogists, practical miners, botanists and chemists; printers, schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, booksellers, authors, publishers, and even reviewers; merchants, to supply us with English goods, and to take our surplus produce; bankers, underwriters, life-insurers, and clerks innumerable; actors, surgeons, and physicians; lawyers, clergymen, singers, music and dancing masters, milliners and other female artists, and, at least, one good Political Economist at each settlement to prevent us from devising an Australasian tariff. Most of these emigrants would call themselves ladies and gentlemen, and would object to pass by the bridge of charity. Consequently we could not force them to preserve an equal sexual proportion; but if an excessive number of males should emigrate, they would create, here, a demand for females, and a supply would immediately follow by the bridge. Moreover, as the value of all land purchased of the government must necessarily rise somewhat above the amount of the purchase-money; and as portions, on or near to which towns would grow up, must rise in value considerably above the government price, the purchase of waste land would be an excellent employment of capital. Much of the surplus capital of Britain, therefore, might be so invested, instead of being given away to monks in Spain and to Tartars in South America. Some of the persons, who should invest their money in this manner,

would emigrate along with it, in order to become the leading men of civilized Australasia. Thus, you see, these colonies, like those of Greece, would "contain a mixture of all classes of society"; they would, every day, open new fields to "all trades, pursuits, and professions," which in England "are becoming more and more overstocked," and would provide for "multitudes of persons of all degrees and ages who," in England, "are moving about, without employment, useless to themselves and a burden to the public." ¹ In fewer words, every grant of land in these colonies would be an extension, though distant, of Britain itself, and would provide so much more room for all classes of Britons.

You will believe that I have reflected a good deal upon this subject. Nevertheless, sometimes when I am in a desponding mood, I exclaim—But where on earth is all the money to come from, that is to pay for all the ships employed by this system, and to confer wealth upon so many of the inhabitants of these extensive regions? To this, when I feel happy and strong in the force of truth, I answer—In the first instance, from places where the money already exists, but is employed with little or no profit; and, ultimately, from the divided labour of millions, who, but for some such permission to labour and multiply, must either die of slow starvation or would never be born! When I reflect that all the wealth that the world contains has been produced by the labour of man, the answer becomes quite satisfactory.

My castle in the air is finished. View it only as a structure of the imagination. Still, does its foundation appear solid? Are its ideal proportions just? Does it seem to unite the chief properties of a good building—usefulness, strength and beauty? If you answer, yes, then I ask, though this plan be too magnificent for execution, may we not really construct a smaller edifice upon this model? In plain English—if the principles here suggested be correct, why should they not be reduced to practice, upon whatever scale?

At any rate it is worth while to inquire, very briefly, what would be the probable effects of some such system, independently of those considerations which form its main principles.

¹ See Preface

CONVICTS

First. In this colony, convict-labour would no longer be of the least value to the capitalist. But it does not follow that, because such a system of colonization would occasion the natural death of negro slavery in South Africa, it should have the same effect on penal slavery in Australasia. There could be no objection to the employment of convicts on various parts of the coast, at a distance from any actual settlement. On the contrary, there would be many reasons in favour of it. If good judgment were exercised in the selection of spots calculated to become important sea-port towns, the Transports would act as pioneers to a future army of Emigrants; and when they had paved the way for a settlement, not penal, they might be removed to other desert places. In this case, their labour would, of course, be confined to preparing the settlement for the habitation of better men; and the penal labourers would be supplied with food from settlements already not penal. As those purified settlements would produce abundance of food, the cost of maintaining convicts in desert places would be infinitely less than on former occasions, when food was obtained from India and even from England. And their labour would repay the cost of their maintenance, in this manner. All the land which they had prepared would be the property of government. The preparation of that land would give it a value over and above the price of mere waste, as determined by the general system. Government, also, would have a right to fix the *scite* [*sic*] of a future town. Much town-land has been sold in New South Wales at the rate of £500 per acre. As, by the operation of the general system, half a dozen years, probably, would produce a larger town than Sydney, government would be able to obtain, for all the prepared land, and especially for the portion destined for town-land, a price very much above the ordinary price of mere waste. The excess, whatever it might be, would belong to government; and it would, I believe, be more than enough to repay the cost of establishing the settlement by convict labour. But I must add a condition to this opinion. As, in the case supposed, government would be a capitalist, employing its money with a view to remunerating profit, any great want of skill, and especially of economy, in the administration, would ensure loss instead of gain.

Secondly. Whilst waste land could be obtained at whatever price, with the certainty of a progressive increase of market

value, colonial capital would naturally be employed in the purchase and cultivation of land—in providing subsistence, that is, for the rapid increase of people which the system of free migration would occasion. And it is taken for granted that the rate of wages in the colony (which must be governed by the price required for waste land) would always be considerably higher than in the mother country; because, otherwise, labourers would not emigrate. It must follow that the colonists would not be manufacturers of any but those coarser goods, which, on account of their bulk and weight, might be produced in the colony for less than the sum of their cost in England and their freight to the colony. The suggested extension of Britain, consequently, must cause a great increase of demand for all the finer British manufactures. I will not weary you with a statement of the process by which we should pay for those British goods, but you will remark that, for a long time to come, every Paul conveyed to, or born in, the colony, would furnish employment to, perhaps, several British Peters. The quantity of employment so furnished to British industry would depend upon the degree in which Britain should be extended; and the degree of that extension would depend upon the degree of skill and singleness of purpose with which the system should be administered, together with, of course, the degree in which births should exceed deaths in this most healthy country. I am inclined to believe that the population of extra-tropical Australasia might increase at the rate of five per cent, per annum, which is the rate of increase in the least wholesome parts of North America.

Thirdly. There exists in England a pretty general feeling that colonies, as such, are of no value to the mother country in any point of view; and that they are injurious, in one respect, by the great expense incurred in governing and defending them. Allow that this opinion is justified by the whole history of modern colonization, that the mere possession of a "new country," "scratched" by a scattered population, is worth nothing, or is even injurious to the possessor; still, may we not conceive that colonization, which is pursued now just as it was two hundred Years ago—that is, without the least attempt at system—is as open to improvement as was, fifty years ago, the carriage of letters? Mr. Palmer's suggestion as to the Post was adopted at once. Within the last twenty years, the same number, at least, of plans of colonization has been suggested, **but** not one of them has been adopted, or was perhaps worthy

of adoption. There is all the more room for improvement. Now, according to this last project, the colonists themselves would defray the whole cost of their government and protection. Suppose the inhabitants of Van Diemen's Land to be 500,000 instead of 25,000; their labour, their produce and their consumption, would be, at least, as 20 to 1, and the produce of their taxes, consequently, would be twenty times what it is at present. We may indeed presume that the produce of 500,000 inhabitants of Van Diemen's Land, would much exceed twenty times the produce of 25,000 inhabitants; because the different *proportion* of people to territory would cause a greater *division of labour*, which is the very soul of production. We may presume, therefore, that any given piece of colony might be as productive of revenue as a similar piece of mother country, and that it would pay as well for its own government. I have a suspicion, however, that after a time the ordinary expense of government might be defrayed out of the proceeds of rent-tax and sales of land, without any great departure from the main principles of the system. That is to say, there might be a constant balance in hand of the Free-migration Fund, after supplying the colonial demand for labour; and it would be proper to employ such a balance in relief of other taxes. Ultimately, as soon as the demand for British emigrants should cease, the proceeds of rent-tax, which would, by then, be very great, might defray the whole cost of colonial government. It follows that, as between the colony and the mother country, there might be scarcely any commercial restrictions; and that, as to the colony only, there might be none at all.

Lastly. Though some of the above speculations may be doubtful, they might perhaps be carried much farther without extravagance. This, however, admits of no uncertainty either way, being positive and self-evident—namely, that the system in question would tend more than anything to preserve an intimate connection between the colony and the mother country. In fact, the mother country and the colony would become partners in a new trade—the creation of happy human beings; one country furnishing the raw material—that is, the land, the dust of which man is made; the other furnishing the machinery—that is, men and women, to convert the unpeopled soil into living images of God. In this honourable and, we may say, even glorious co-partnership, the interest of the mother country would be greater than that of the colony; and a rupture of their connection would, therefore, be most injurious to the former.

If the system of free migration should be destroyed by a war of independence, the colony might still pursue the system of restriction, and so preserve all the desirable attributes of an old people; but in that case, the mother country would lose a given portion of the means by which she had enjoyed the one great good that belongs to new countries—the power of supplying a constant increase of territory according to the wants of the people. The mother country, therefore, in governing the colony, would consult the greatest advantage of the colonists, in order to preserve their friendship; and the colonists, having much to lose and being incapable of dispersion, would feel a wholesome dread of war. The colonists, being an instructed and civilized people, would be as well qualified to govern themselves as the people of Britain; and, being a wealthy people, they would be able, without going to war, to assert the birth-right of all British subjects—to enforce in the British Parliament, against a bad British ministry, their claim to equality before the law. Qualified, entitled, and powerful to govern themselves, they might either take a share in framing the general laws of the empire, by means of their representatives in the British Parliament; or, if a mean jealousy on the part of Englishmen should prevent such an arrangement, they might frame their own laws, in a Colonial Assembly, under the eye of a viceroy, incapable of wrong and possessing a veto like the king of England, but whose secretaries, like the ministers of England, should be responsible to the people! At all events, they must be governed, by whatever machinery, with a view to their good and their contentment, which is the greatest good, instead of to the satisfaction of their governors only. This would render them happy in a most intimate connection with their mother country; and the American war of independence would no longer be a favourite theme in the still dependent colonies of Britain. Mutual dependence would prevent oppression on the one part, and on the other a wish for independence; reciprocity of interest would occasion mutual good will; there would no longer be injurious distinctions, or malignant jealousies, or vulgar hatred between British subjects, wherever born; and Britain would become the centre of the most extensive, the most civilized, and, above all, the happiest empire in the world.

CONCLUSION

On high hopes like these you might exist comfortably, even here. Without them you would be miserable; because you are neither a poor lieutenant; nor a broken farmer; nor a mere sensualist, who could delight in starving his mind in order that his body might enjoy a gross plenty; nor a "desperate or needy man"; nor a "labourer"; nor a "mechanic"; nor a "convict." If, now that the public mind of England is fermenting with colonial projects, you think it probable that colonization will be conducted systematically, with a view to the greatest benefit of the mother country, come here by all means; "for the land is not able to bear you all, that you may dwell together." But if you see no such prospect, go any where but to a new country, unless you *want* to be miserable. For my part, the Sun which I learned to love in Italy, and Hope, which, if you know how to indulge it, is more grateful than reality, tempt me to remain for the present.

POSTSCRIPT

WITHOUT regard to the excess of people in Britain, and to the benefits which the mother country might derive from treating her colonies as so many extensions of her own territory; the mode of colonization which I have ventured to propose, might, it appears to me, be adopted in Australasia with infinite advantage to the colonists, by establishing a free bridge between the settlements and those numerous over-peopled countries, by which they are, as it were, surrounded. Many of the islands of the Pacific Ocean have a superabundant population, who, constantly exposed to the want of food, would rejoice to emigrate to this country and to supply our urgent want of labourers, if we did but offer them a free passage and plenty to eat. The British dominions in India might afford us a much larger supply; for though, hitherto, the Hindoos have been disinclined to emigrate, the most careless observer must see that a great moral revolution has commenced in British India, that the obstinate prejudices of ages are there beginning to disappear, and that but little management would be required to induce the poorest class of Hindoos to labour and enjoy in Australasia, rather than drown their children in the sacred stream, or die of misery near their own temples. But the Chinese, especially, who, with a population of 300,000,000, feel the pressure of people upon territory more than any other nation whatsoever,—who are greatly disposed to emigrate,—and who are by far the most industrious and skilful of Asiatics—might, not only supply the want of labourers now felt in the British Australasian settlements, but they might, in the course of a century, perhaps, convert the whole of this enormous wilderness into a fruitful garden. This last proposition must, I know, appear extravagant to him who thinks old times and old ways the best, and who considers novel and visionary as synonymous terms. Even to him I would recal [*sic*] the migrations of the northern hordes; who, in no very long period of time, overran the most fruitful regions of Europe, and kept possession of them notwithstanding vigorous opposition. To others, to those who believe that mankind is in a state of progressive improvement, and who, instead of only shaking their heads, heartily rejoice at every useful novelty, whether

mechanical, moral, or political, I offer the following evidence in support of what I have asserted. But, first, let me remind you once more, that, according to the proposed system of colonization, the amount of colonial capital, in other words, the demand for waste land and for emigrant labourers, as well as the means of free migration, must increase, continually, with the increase of immigration, until all the land shall be appropriated and cultivated. Supposing new settlements to be made on the southern, north-western, northern, and north-eastern coasts of Australia, the demand for emigrant labourers and the means for supplying it, would extend along a line of above eight thousand miles; and it is certainly possible, that the population of China should furnish millions, even, of emigrants every year, without any diminution of its domestic number,—inasmuch as those only would emigrate, who, but for the offer of free migration, either would die of misery or would never be born.

My purpose in making the following quotations is to satisfy you that the Chinese are well disposed to emigrate, and that it would be hardly possible to select a more useful description of labourers.

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 farther resemblance between them. The Chinese have, there, no way of getting forward but by the 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 allege that they were 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 exceed 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, by profits arising from theatrical exhibitions and fireworks, 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 these 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 shoemakers. 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 very important and 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 an 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 were 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 nth they began to remove out of the streets the dead bodies, the interment of which employed 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 as 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 Hottentots 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 numbers, 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 far short of a hundred thousand; and who, with a system of free trade, and free cultivation, *would soon accumulate tenfold*, by natural increase within the island and gradual accessions of new settlers from home. They reside principally in the three great capitals of Batavia, Semarang, and Surabaya, 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 Hui, n 1822, speaks as follows of the Chinese emigrants at Penang and Singapore:

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. Everyone 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 very regular habits, who had established on this spot the mechanical arts, on a scale which might even vie with that of European artists, but which we should 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 nations 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 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 benefit 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 Singapore), 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 other 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, often of the most adventurous nature; and we may remark by the way, that they are often immoderately fond of games of chance, as cards, dice, cock-fighting. Inebriety is a vice of which they are but rarely guilty. . . . Notwithstanding the prohibitory laws of the celestial empire, *there would appear to be no other limit to the extent of emigration than the capacity of individuals to procure a passage to the neighbouring countries*, modified, in some degree, by the greater or less demand for industry. It must be recollected, however, that this emigration is to be considered as temporary, the majority of the Chinese calculating upon returning after a time to their respective provinces. Their wives, or females of any description, are not permitted to accompany them abroad, to which circumstance it is perhaps chiefly owing that the Chinese have formed no colonies or other settlements, for the establishment of which their situation is peculiarly favourable.

The above quotations give an exact description of the emigrating Chinese *at this present time*) and I have availed myself of them, in order to bring you to my opinion, by means of the superior language and authority of very eminent persons, who wrote without any ruling idea. Mr. Barrow has declared that a few thousand Chinese emigrants would be of more advantage

than a rich gold-mine, to the British colony in South **Africa**; but he expressed that opinion on intimate acquaintance **with** the Chinese character, and he formed his opinion of the Chinese long before he had an opportunity of observing the urgent want of labourers at the Cape of Good Hope. His account of the Chinese in Java, therefore, must be considered as perfectly unprejudiced by any views of colonization, though, no doubt, the idea on which I am dwelling is rather his than mine.

That idea, indeed, must strike every man at all acquainted with the facts; for who can be aware of the crowded state of the Chinese, and of their admirable qualities as settlers in a waste country, without feeling surprised that they did not long ago overrun this naturally happy wilderness, which seems to be made on purpose, one may almost say, to receive their superabundant millions. And is it not still more surprising that these British settlers, who would gladly purchase slaves at one hundred pounds per head, should not have procured labourers from Canton? The labouring classes there, I am credibly informed, frequently make offers to the masters of English ships to bind themselves to labour, without wages, during three days in the week, for a term of years, in return for a free passage to any British settlement. Those abstemious and industrious creatures, who, at home, cannot by the most constant and vigorous labour, earn more than just enough to preserve their lives, are confident of being able to acquire comparative wealth by the free disposal of half of their time in any new country. But I have already explained at length why the colonial employer of labour makes no efforts to obtain indented servants, even at the cheapest rate of wages. However, to repeat the words of Mr. Finlayson, "there would appear to be no other limit to the extent of Chinese emigration, than the capacity of individuals to procure a free passage to the neighbouring countries"; and I have suggested, what appears to me, a certain means of providing free transport to unlimited numbers. Supposing me not to be mistaken in my view of the mode, and the degree, in which the proposed system of colonization would operate, there might be a constant immigration of Chinese labourers at every settlement in Australasia; and, considering the transcendent skill of those people in the management of water, they might, within a century, convert this immense desert into a fruitful garden, provided always that females should **be** permitted to emigrate in equal number with the males.

The existing obstacles to the emigration of females appear to

me to be the only bar to a most rapid increase of the Australasian people, by means of emigration from China; but I believe that those obstacles might be removed. It is certain that, in seasons of scarcity, great numbers of Chinese females migrate, with their husbands and parents, from the seaward provinces into Tartary, and it is the Tartar government, alone, of China which prevents their emigration by sea. But two questions therefore remain: 1st, Whether the governors of the seaward provinces might be persuaded, or bribed, or compelled, to permit the emigration of women? 2nd, Whether, if once a considerable body of Chinese men had *established* themselves in Australasia, enjoying perfect security of person and property, whether in goods or *land*, they would not readily procure women from their mother country, in spite of its government? These questions can be answered by experience alone; but the experiment seems worth an effort of diplomatic skill—not by means of a pompous embassy, wherewith to frighten the timid rulers of China—but through the intervention of a class of persons who, by hook or by crook, would procure *tea* from China, in spite of all earthly obstacles.

It would appear, at first sight, that the people of England have no motive for enabling the Chinese to multiply according to the laws of nature, by means of free migration. But would it be no advantage to British manufacturers to enjoy free trade with millions of fellow subjects of Chinese origin, and, *through them*, perhaps, with hundreds of millions of customers in the celestial empire? I must not, however, enter on so large a question; my only object in these remarks being to promote an examination of the whole subject, by those who have a special interest in it and who are best qualified to conduct such an inquiry.

APPENDIX

OUTLINE

OF A SYSTEM OF COLONIZATION

ARTICLE I

It is suggested,

That a payment in money of—¹ per acre be required for all future grants of land without exception.

For the execution of this provision, the *mode* of selling waste land in North America would furnish a useful model.

ARTICLE II

That all land now granted, and to be granted, throughout the colony, be declared liable to a tax of—* per cent, upon the actual rent.

As this is not a land-tax, but a tax upon *rent*, the yearly amount of the tax would be determined, either by the actual receipt of rent, or by the estimated letting value of land when occupied by the landlord; and the machinery for collecting the tax might be the same as that by which county rates are levied in England.

ARTICLE III

That the proceeds of the tax upon rent, and of sales, form an *Emigration Fund*, to be employed in the conveyance of British Labourers to the colony free of cost.

This provision explains itself. It may be remarked, however, that, in conjunction with the other provisions, it would supply the desideratum, so anxiously sought by the Parliamentary Emigration Committee; namely, a means of conducting the emigration of paupers from Britain, *without any expense to the country*. The principle on which the recommendation of the Committee was founded, is, that the labour of paupers, removed from an old to a new country, will repay the cost of their removal. No doubt it

¹ Amount not specified.

will; but the measure proposed by the Committee offers *no security* for repayment. They suggest that Government shall advance to the Pauper Emigrant, not only the cost of his passage, but also stock, implements and food for a year; holding as security for repayment, the bit of forest or swamp on which he shall be located. The pauper, necessarily ignorant and imprudent, is to be converted, all at once, into a landowner, and under circumstances, which, above all others, require much intelligence and the greatest prudence. He is not to be planted on a small grant, in the midst of rich, intelligent and prudent emigrants, whose example and assistance might lead him to profit by the great change in his condition; but thousands like him are to be planted in masses, and left entirely to their own guidance. His land, being in a country where land can be obtained for next to nothing, will possess no value, except according to the degree in which it shall be improved. The security of the Government, therefore, for the repayment of its advance, is the emigrant's good fortune and good conduct. He will be subject to fever, and in a society so composed, to idleness, drunkenness, blunders, and despair; any one of which must prevent him from fulfilling the condition of his grant. Here then is an end of security, in the usual sense of the word. Moreover, the settler will be tempted by the high wages of labour at no great distance, to sell his stock, quit his embarrassing estate, and return to his proper condition of a labourer for hire. Many attempts have been made, both in America and in New South Wales, to settle paupers in masses, isolated from capital, intelligence and prudence. Such attempts at plantation have almost universally failed. The poor, ignorant, imprudent landowner has sunk under his troubles; his land has passed away to the dealer in rum; and, the wages of labour near him being very high, he has returned to his proper condition of a labourer for hire. Unquestionably the emigration of paupers, according to the system proposed by the Committee, would greatly benefit the condition of the persons removed; but there is no security for repayment to Government of the expense incurred by their removal; and this country is not inclined to risk further taxation for any purpose, bad or good. These, we may suppose, are the reasons why Mr. Wilmot Horton's benevolent plan has been received by all parties, with apathy, if not with dislike.

Recurring to the proposed measure, whatever the extent of emigration for which it should provide, the whole would occur without any expense to this country. Emigration would be carried on by private speculation, not to the loss but to the advantage of those who should defray its expense. A part of that expense would be defrayed beforehand by the produce of rent-tax and sales; or, if that produce were anticipated, there would be ample security for repayment to those who should make the advance.

The Parliamentary Committee on Emigration have provided the machinery for executing all that part of the proposed measure which concerns the mere removal of the emigrant from Britain to the Colony.

ARTICLE IV

That those to whom the administration of the Fund shall be entrusted, be empowered to raise money on that security, as money is raised on the security of parish and county rates in England.

ARTICLE v

That the supply of Labourers be as nearly as possible proportioned to the demand for Labour at each Settlement; so that Capitalists shall never suffer from an urgent want of Labourers, and that Labourers shall never want well-paid employment.

The execution of this provision would require considerable intelligence and judgment in the persons to whom it might be confided. It is proposed, that there should be an Agent of Emigration at each settlement. His duties would be,

First, To supply the Government at home with accurate information as to the state of demand for labourers in the Settlement; and according to his reports, the supply of emigrants would be carefully regulated.

Secondly, To receive the emigrants on their arrival, and to facilitate their being hired by capitalists.

Thirdly, To furnish them with a very moderate provision until hired.

The first duty is the most important. In the infancy of a Settlement, the agent might very accurately learn the state of demand for labour, by receiving applications from capitalists, and keeping an exact registry of the same. Afterwards, as the Settlement should increase, and capitalists should be far removed from the seat of Colonial Government, he must take great pains to collect true information, and to judge soundly.

ARTICLE VI

That, in the selection of Emigrants, an absolute preference be given to young persons, and that no excess of males be conveyed to the colony free of cost.

A thousand emigrants of all ages might not, at the end of twenty years, increase the Colonial population by more than that number. As many might die as would be born, and, if there were an excess of males, the number might, at the end of twenty years, be much less than a thousand. But five hundred young couples, supposing that each couple rear six children, and that in twenty years half of the original emigrants be dead, would, in that short period, increase the Colonial population by three thousand five hundred souls. Any number of emigrants, in short, would, if selected as proposed, treble

themselves in the first twenty years; whereas, a number of emigrants of all ages might not, and probably would not, begin to increase till the end of twenty years.

Supposing the cost of conveying one thousand emigrants to be £20,000, that sum, increasing for twenty years at compound interest of five per cent., would be £53,000. Supposing one thousand emigrants *of all ages* to be conveyed in the year 1830, the cost of increasing the Colonial population by a thousand souls, in the year 1850, would be £53,000; whereas, if young couples only were selected, an increase of a thousand souls would be obtained, in 1850, by the emigration in 1830, of three hundred persons, at a cost (allowing compound interest of five per cent, for twenty years) of £16,000.

This is an extreme calculation; but it is offered only to illustrate a principle. By adopting that principle in the conduct of emigration, in conjunction with the rest of the proposed measure, might not the crown eventually sell land in the Colonies for as high a price as could be obtained for fertile land, rising miraculously out of the sea, close to Britain?

ARTICLE VII

That Colonists providing a passage for emigrant Labourers, being young persons and equal numbers of both sexes, be entitled to a payment in money from the Emigration Fund, equal to the actual contract price of a passage for so many labouring persons.

The object of this regulation is to enable capitalists to obtain labourers accustomed to any particular kind of cultivation. It would not at all interfere with the general principles on which the whole measure is founded.

ARTICLE VIII

That Grants be absolute in fee, without any condition whatsoever, and obtainable by deputy.

The other regulations of the proposed measure would obviate the necessity for conditions. All the conditions at present attached to grants of colonial land, are intended to prevent the misappropriation and neglect of land. They have entirely failed of their object; but that object would be obtained, in the most simple and certain manner, by the proposed measure. As the supply of labourers would always be in proportion to the land granted, the grantee, if he did not let his land, would surely cultivate it. It cannot be doubted that, at present, grantees of waste land wish to fulfil the conditions of their grants. To do so would be for their own advantage; but the dearness of labour,—the absolute want of labourers,—prevents them from doing so. In the proposed case, the grantee would have the power to consult his own advantage, by cultivating his land. It is for this that he would pay, when appearing to pay for his title to the land; and it is to be presumed that he would not

neglect that which he had purchased at a considerable price. It seems, therefore, quite unnecessary to bind him to do what every man in his situation would be sure to do without any bond. If this view of the subject be correct, it furnishes a strong argument in favour of the whole measure. The governments of all new colonies have adopted the principle of checking the misappropriation of land, and have hitherto universally failed in their attempts to give effect to that principle. The proposed measure, it is conceived, would at once give complete effect to that excellent principle, by securing what alone has been sought by the conditions attached to grants.

That grants should be obtainable by deputy, that is, without emigration, is recommended with a view to treat colonial land as much as possible like land that should, miraculously, rise out of the sea close to Britain. In the imagined case, the purchaser of land would not be compelled to reside on his grant. Whether or not he should reside on his grant would be wholly unimportant, with a view to the effect of an increase of territory in causing a decrease of pauperism. So in the proposed case, the grantee, even though he should never quit London, could not misappropriate land. His purchase-money would be employed in augmenting the colonial population, in proportion to the extent of his grant. His land therefore would yield rent; and of course it would be cultivated, though not by him.

If this conclusion is reasonable, it is much to be desired that grants should be obtainable without emigration. The whole object of the proposed measure is to diminish the evils of pauperism in Britain, and to promote colonization, by rendering the purchase of waste land a very profitable employment of capital. The greater the quantity of land purchased, the more gratifying would be the results of the proposed measure. Consequently the purchase of waste land should be encouraged as much, and checked as little, as possible. An obligation to emigrate would be a serious check. If there were no such obligation, much British capital might be invested in the purchase of colonial land. Such a mode of investment would be peculiarly eligible for properties intended to accumulate, and would, perhaps, be preferable to any investment in reversionary property. Every argument, at least, which favours the presumption that the whole measure would cause a rapid advance in the rent of land, is an argument also in favour of such investments. For the increase of rent is an increase of market value; and if the increase were rapid, such investments would be a very profitable employment of money. London capitalists would require no other encouragement to assist in giving effect to the proposed system of colonial policy.

ARTICLE IX

That any surplus of the proceeds of the tax upon rent and of sales, over what is required for Emigration, be employed in relief of other taxes, and for the general purposes of Colonial Government.

"If a body of people were to migrate into a new country, and land had not yet become private property, there would be this reason for considering the rent of land as a source peculiarly adapted to supply the exigencies of the government: that industry would not, by that means, sustain the smallest repression, and that the expense of the government would be defrayed without imposing any burthen upon any individual. The owners of capital would enjoy its profits; the class of labourers would enjoy their wages, without any deduction whatsoever; and every man would employ his capital in the way which was really most advantageous, without any inducement from the mischievous operation of a tax, to remove it from a channel, in which it was more, to one in which it would be less productive to the nation. There is, therefore, a peculiar advantage in reserving the rent of land as a fund for supplying the exigencies of the state."¹

All the expense of the measure itself, that is, the whole cost of surveys, of the collection of rent-tax, and of emigration, would, of course, be at once defrayed by the proceeds of rent-tax and sales. The utmost economy of administration would be indispensable to the success of the measure; and especially that economy which would devote as much as possible to the mere passage of emigrants, and as little as possible to the salaries of officers. Perhaps the surplus of the fund produced by rent-tax and sales over what would be required to maintain a constant supply of labour in proportion to the demand, would, at times, be very considerable. Such surplus might properly be employed in the construction of roads, bridges, canals, docks, or other public works, having a tendency to increase production and consumption, that is to raise the rent of land. Perhaps also that surplus might be sufficiently great to defray a part, or even the whole, of the expense of colonial government.

1. It is suggested that this mode of disposing of waste land should be rendered permanent by an act of the Legislature. Because, without the best security for its permanence, capitalists would not, to any great extent, either purchase waste land, or advance money on the future proceeds of rent-tax and sales.

2. To operate effectually, this mode of disposing of waste land should be adopted in all the settlements of any colony actual and future. Otherwise the capitalists of a settlement where land might be obtained for nothing, would, in order to supply their consequent want of labourers, entice away the labourers of other settlements, where land had been obtained by payment; and the purchasers of land would thereby be cheated of their consideration.

3. The measure could not be applied to Canada. Because the vicinity of the United States would induce emigrant labourers to emigrate once more in search of waste land, or extravagant wages; and the purchasers of waste land in Canada, would thereby be cheated of their consideration. It appears peculiarly adapted to Australasia: in the first place, because, in that country, the acquisition of land at no great distance from the sea, might proceed for ages to come; and the cost of transport, both for emigrants and for

¹ Mill's Elements of Political Economy.

produce, would be much less than in a country, where colonization could proceed only at a great distance from the sea: secondly, because the profit on the employment of capital in colonization would depend on the increase of people; and in Australasia the absence of those diseases which afflict other new countries, and of many diseases which are fatal to children in Europe, would permit an unexampled excess of births over deaths: thirdly, because the Australasian settlements are yet in their infancy; no uniform system of granting land has yet been established in them; and an uniform system might be established there without injury to any existing class of persons.

4. It seems difficult to discover any class of persons whose vested rights, or other interests, would be injuriously affected by the measure. The actual grantees of land, whom, at first sight, it would appear to tax, are exactly the class of persons that would gain the most by it. As waste land would no longer be obtainable but by payment of—² per acre, their land must very soon possess that market value, at least; and the tax upon rent, not being a land-tax, would take from them only a part of what, in most cases, the tax itself would first bestow.

5. It would be in accordance with the principles on which the suggested measure is founded, to allow the occupation of waste land for grazing, as such occupation is now usefully permitted in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. The object of that permission would be to give a temporary additional value to appropriated land, and to facilitate the rapid increase of capital in the shape of animal food. Whenever a demand should occur for the purchase of land so occupied, the time would be come for making that land still more productive; and then its occupation by the owner of other land ought properly to cease.

6. Supposing the measure to be adopted, its operation might be materially retarded, if the intention of Government to adopt it were publicly known before the first step towards execution. The first step towards execution would be to put a stop to the granting of land according to the various existing regulations. Were the intention of government to take that step publicly known, and were it, besides, publicly understood that, before long, no grants would be made but for payment in money, and that every grant would provide for a given increase of people, very many grants would be hastily obtained on the easiest of present terms. A very great misappropriation of land would take place. Such misappropriation would be directly contrary to the whole spirit of the measure, and must retard its beneficial effects, by postponing the time when the increase of people and capital, in proportion to appropriated land, should cause a demand for fresh grants at a money price. But when government had taken that first step, publicity would be useful, by affording to individual and joint-stock capitalists time to prepare for giving effect to the new system of colonization, as soon as possible after it had been established by law.

¹ Amount not specified.

THE ART OF COLONIZATION

THE ART OF COLONIZATION

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 modern Europe, however, have had a

motive of affection for colonies. "Sancho Panza," says Mr. Mill, "had a scheme for deriving advantage from the government of an island. He would sell the people for slaves and put the money into his pocket." The Few, in some countries, find in 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, 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 government 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 Note¹ 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

¹ Not included in this extract.

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 necessities were produced. 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 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 inquiry 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 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 inhabitants 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 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 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/or *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. // 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 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 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; 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 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 for each person, not less than £625,000. Supposing that they took with them a capital of £5 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. Does anyone 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, are questions 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.

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

sional 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 Company is negotiating 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.¹

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

¹ Not included in this extract.

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 anyone 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 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 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 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 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 for 500,000 acres of land at Spencer's Gulph on the south coast of Australia, intending to lay out £375,000 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 remainder 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 waterbutts from England for the use of the English fleet on a freshwater 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."¹ 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, 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 Diemeris 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,

ENGLAND AND AMERICA

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 control over all the land in the country, disposed of that land in the following way. They first declared that anyone 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 anyone 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 accomplished, 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

DISPOSAL OF WASTE LAND

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.

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

i. 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 people 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 anyone 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-evident 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 everywhere 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 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 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

DISPOSAL OF WASTE LAND

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 downright 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 *seignmries* 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 Abbe 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 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 example¹; 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 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

¹ Not included in this extract.

DISPOSAL OF WASTE LAND

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.

i. 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 cut suivi le systeme de colonization que j'avais etabli. N'ayant plus a. m'occuper de Constantine et d'Oran, j'aurais porte tous mes soins, toute mon attention, sur la ville d'Alger et les environs. Notre etablissement sur ce point, aisement surveille, eut pris, peu a peu, et sans exiger presque aucun frais, une extension suffisante. A mesure que des colons Europeens seraient arrives, on aurait gagne du terrain; et lorsque les besoins de la colonie l'eussent exige, on aurait pris une partie suffisante

du territoire d'Oran et de Constantine. Vouloir *colonizer en mime temps la rdgence toute entitre*, vouloir mettre des garnisons sur tous les points, avoir la pretention de tout retenir des aujourd'hui sous notre domination immediate, tout cela me paraît être un projet chimérique: en faire même l'essai serait de compromettre le succès de notre établissement en Afrique, et entraîner l'état, en pure perte, dans des défenses 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 innkeepers. 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 innkeepers, 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 cost of going round by sea and the cost of travelling on a straight road open to the competition of innkeepers. It would not be easy to find, even in Ireland, a match for this job; but many to match it have taken place in

DISPOSAL OF WASTE LAND

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 choose 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 *is. 6d.* per acre in conveying labourers to the settlement, or the investment of capital on the land at the rate of *is. 6d.* 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 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 anyone 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.

DISPOSAL OF WASTE LAND

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: 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 recall 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 is. 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, the governor's caprice still determines whereabouts land shall be surveyed and granted. Though anyone may wait upon the governor with the new regulations in his hand, saying,—I want so many acres in such a spot: take my money,—the governor may reply, No; that spot is reserved: 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

DISPOSAL OF WASTE LAND

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: 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 anyone, 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 parasites 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 and 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 government 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 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 it¹: the rich mine of gold is worth nothing. But allowing for some caution in colonial governments, the evils

¹ Last year, a hundred thousand acres of picked land near 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.

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 colonising 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 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, anyone 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 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 exeept-

tional 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.

i. It has been said: If the price of new land were high enough to prevent anyone 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 everyone 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, 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 ensure 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 explained, 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, something 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 somebody. 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, repayment 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 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 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 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.¹

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

¹ 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 ship-owners 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 those minute enactments which the English parliament has made for the regulation of emigrant ships.

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 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 *is. 6d.* per acre on his grant of 500,000 acres, appeared to pay £37,500 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 in conveying labourers to the settlement, or had sold the grant for £37,000, 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. per acre. No land, it is plain, ought to be granted to remain uncleared. Now suppose that the government should require £4. 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 for new land, might, with greater advantage to themselves, have paid twice the amount, or £1,400,000 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 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; 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 to £2 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. 55. per acre for his land when cleared, that is 55. for the title and £4 for the clearing; or to pay £2 10s. for the land when cleared, that is 105. instead of 55. for the title, and £2 instead of £4 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 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 fertile. 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

THE REMOVAL OF PEOPLE

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.¹

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

¹ The English Government makes five shillings per acre the upset price of waste land in New South Wales and Van Dicmen's Land. With perfect liberty of appropnation 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 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.

the cost of passage from England to Canada to be £7, and from England to Australia to be £17, and that the price of new land in both colonies were £1 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 per acre, with £7 for the cost of passage, should give the right proportion between land and people, then it would be clear that with £17 for the cost of passage, £1 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, 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 undertakings 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 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 maybe 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 2000, there seem to be grounds for believing that, if all these had been young couples 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 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.

The moral advantages of such a selection of immigrants would not be few. Each female would 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 opportunity 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, anyone 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 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 ratepayers, 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 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 surprised 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 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 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 104,477,5!:. Whatever would be the effect on population of 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 $\frac{28}{31}$, 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, the cost of entirely depopulating England would be a yearly outlay, for some years, of £1,050,000; 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. 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.

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.¹ 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 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;

¹ Not included in this extract.

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 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 increase 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 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.¹ 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 anyone. 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 ensure 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

¹ This Appendix, not reproduced here, is well worth study by any one interested in early Colonial Office methods and principles.

GOVERNMENT OF COLONIES

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 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 anyone, 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 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 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 exten-

sion, 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 advantage 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 notwithstanding 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 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, the salaries of officers alone, being £53,468; 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 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 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 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 virum 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 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 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

GOVERNMENT OF COLONIES

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 conception 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 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, choosing 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 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 everyone 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

GOVERNMENT OF COLONIES

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 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 anywhere 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.

THE SUFFICIENT PRICE

THE SUFFICIENT PRICE

LETTER XLVI. FROM THE COLONIST

The colonist suggests the means by which land might be made dear enough to prevent a scarcity of labour for hire.

SOME land in colonies is as dear as the dearest land in old countries. In Wall Street, and the lower part of Broadway, New York, land is even dearer than in Lombard-street and Cornhill, London; the reason being that the part of New York which has become the centre of the commerce of that great city, is a narrow point of land hemmed in on three sides by water, so that although commerce in New York is less, the competition for room at the centre of commerce is greater than *in* London. So in various parts of every colony, there is land which fetches a high price, because it is of limited extent. In new countries, nearly as in old, land in the centre of a city, in every part of a town, or in the immediate vicinity of towns, or of good roads, is of limited extent. It is land enjoying certain advantages of position; and as such land is no more unlimited in America or Australia than in England, it is, as in England, the subject of competition, and fetches a price measured by the degree of competition for it. But this land is not that of which the cheapness produces scarcity of labour in new countries: it is land so dear as to be either out of the reach of the working-classes, or for them less desirable at its price than land for which there is little or no competition. This last is the land by means of obtaining which labourers become landowners: it may be called indifferently the lowest-priced land, the cheapest land, or land of the minimum price. I beg you to bear in mind, that only the cheapest land in a colony, is that whose price affects the labour market.

The price of this land, as of all bare land, and of everything else which it costs nothing to produce, depends of course on the relation between the demand and the supply. In colonies,

where wages are so high that everybody may soon acquire the means of purchasing land, the demand is according to population; the supply consists of the quantity of the cheapest land open to purchasers. By augmenting the population or diminishing the quantity of land, the price would be raised: it would be lowered by augmenting the quantity of land or diminishing the population. Now, over the proportion which these two shall bear to each other, the state or government possesses an absolute control. The amount of population indeed does not depend on the government; but the quantity of land does; and thus the government has control over the proportion which land bears to population, or population to land. In the very beginning of a colony, all the land necessarily belongs to the government or is under its jurisdiction; and it is the government which suddenly or by degrees makes all the land private property, by disposing of it to individuals. The government may employ a profuse or a niggard hand; that is, it may bestow much or little on the colonists in proportion to their numbers. In West Australia, for example, the government allowed the first 2000 settlers to appropriate about 3,000,000 acres; whilst in South Australia, with a population now amounting to 40,000, less, I believe, than 500,000 acres have become private property: in one case, 2000 people got as much land as the counties of Middlesex, Essex, Suffolk, Hertford, and Cambridge; in the other, 40,000 people got only as much land as the county of Cambridge: the bestowing disposition of the government was a hundred and nineteen times stronger, and the proportion of private land to people a hundred and nineteen times greater, in the one case than in the other. The history of colonization abounds with like examples of the control exercised by government over the proportion between land and people.

It has been said above, that government may dispose of land with a niggard hand. Do not suppose that any colonizing government has ever done so. All colonizing governments have done just the reverse, by disposing of land with a profuse hand. The greediness of colonists has been equal to the profusion of the governments. The colonists, full of the ideas about land which possess people in old countries—emigrating indeed because at home the cheapest land had got or was getting to be scarce and precious—could never obtain too much land for the satisfaction of their desires; and the governments, universally down to the other day, seemed to have looked upon waste land as a

useless property of the state, only fit to be squandered in satisfying the greedy desires of colonists. Throughout what may be termed the colonial world, therefore, allowing however for a few exceptions in which a colony has grown to be as densely peopled as an old country, there has at all times existed a proportion between land and people, which almost prevented competition for the cheapest land, and enabled every colonist to obtain some land either for nothing or for a price little more than nominal. Whatever may have been the price of the dearest land in a colony, the price of the cheapest has never, with the above exceptions, been sufficient to prevent labourers from turning into landowners after a very brief term of hired service.

There are two modes *in* which the government disposes of waste land; either by gift or sale. Gift, or grant, as it is called, has been the most common mode. Until lately, the British Government always disposed of land by grant. The United States, soon after they became independent, adopted the plan of selling, to which, with the exception of some extensive grants, they have since adhered. About seventeen years ago, our government substituted throughout the colonies the plan of selling for that of granting.

The plan of granting may be said to involve unavoidably an extreme profusion in the disposal of land. When the land can be got for nothing, everybody wants as much of it as he can possibly get; and the government, of course deeming the land of no value, or it would not part with it for nothing, is prone to indulge the greedy desires of individuals by a process so very easy to the government as that of saying "take what you please." Under this plan, therefore, the quantity of land granted has always been so very abundant in proportion to population, that it may be said to have been supplied, like air or water, in unlimited quantities; that is, not in any proportion to the market-demand for land, but so as to prevent such a demand. In many cases, the government made a practice of giving land to people of the labouring class, when of course there was no market-demand for land except in advantageous positions, and the cheapest land was so cheap as to bear no price at all. Even when grants were not made directly to the class of labourers, the profusion with which they were made to other classes, caused the cheapest land to be "dirt cheap," and indirectly bestowed land upon labourers for almost nothing: practically, under this system of profusion, the government

exercised no control over the proportion between land and people.

Even if the government should intend to carry out the plan in such a manner as to prevent scarcity of labour by making the cheapest land somewhat dear, or difficult of acquisition, it would not be able to accomplish the object by that means. The purpose of the government would be defeated by the nature of things. So long as land was to be obtained for nothing, the greediness of individuals to obtain it would be irresistible by the government, even for a single year. Supposing that the government resisted for a while, and so made the cheapest land comparatively dear, the greediness to obtain for nothing land bearing a price (for in the supposed case all land would have a market value) would overcome the resistance of the firmest government, and again knock down the price of the cheapest land. But further, supposing that the government did resist the importunity for grants of valuable land, by what means could it regulate the supply so as to maintain the most beneficial proportion between land and people? How would it know from time to time what quantities of land ought to be granted? How could it estimate the different effects on the markets of land and labour of granting this or that quantity? These questions show that the plan of granting is devoid of regulating power; that it is incompatible with the indispensable employment of a measure of supply. And lastly, there is an objection to the plan of granting, which is very strong without an effectual restriction of the quantity, but would be stronger with it. However profusely land may be granted, some of it acquires in time a value depending on advantages of position: and this consideration explains why people are so greedy to obtain land for nothing, even though at the time of being obtained it has no market value. This consideration also shows that under the plan of granting, however profusely, the government has the opportunity, and the strongest temptation, to favour its friends, to practise favouritism and official jobbing in the disposal of land. There is no instance of a colonizing government that was able to resist this temptation. Official favouritism and jobbing in the disposal of land by grant, constitute one of the most prominent and ugliest features of colonial history: and they have been one of the most effectual impediments to colonization, by producing an immense crop of disappointments, jealousies, envies, and irritations. But if favouritism and jobbing in the disposal of waste land made the colonists hate

each other and their government when the quantity granted was practically without limit, what would happen if the quantity were so restricted as to render all the land granted immediately valuable? The government would be more than ever tempted to favour its friends; the officials more than ever tempted to favour themselves and their connections; the friends of government and the connections of officials greedier of land than was ever known; and the whole colony in an uproar of disaffection to its government. This is the last objection to the plan of granting. It was by placing all these objections before Lord Ho wick in 1831 that the colonizing theorists of 1830 put an end to the plan of granting waste land throughout our colonies.

LETTER XLVII. FROM THE COLONIST

In order that the price of waste land should accomplish its objects, it must be sufficient for the purpose. Hitherto the price has been everywhere insufficient.

The plan of selling contains within itself an effectual regulator of the quantity disposed of. This is the price which the government requires for new land. This price may indeed be so low, as not to operate as a restriction at all. This happened in Canada when the plan of selling was first adopted there, and when the price required by the government hardly amounted to more, or may even have amounted to less, upon small purchases, than the fees of office previously required for grants. The first price of public land in Tasmania was 5s. an acre: the cost of a Tasmanian grant in two cases with which I happen to be acquainted, was £58 for 50 acres, and nearly £100 for 70 acres. In the colonies generally, I believe, excepting as to large purchases, a grant used to cost more than the price which was afterwards required by the government when it substituted selling for granting. So low a price as this has no influence on the market value of the cheapest land, no effect on the supply of labour for hire. The mere putting of a price, therefore, on all new land may accomplish none of the objects in view. In order to accomplish them, the price must be sufficient for that purpose. But the price may be low or high as the government pleases: it is a variable force, completely under the control of government. In founding a colony, the price might be so low as to render the quantity of land appropriated by settlers practically unlimited: it might be high

enough to occasion a proportion between land and people similar to that of old countries, in which case, if this very high price did not prevent emigration, the cheapest land in the colony "might be as dear, and the superabundance of labourers as deplorable as in England: or it might be a just medium between the two, occasioning neither superabundance of people nor superabundance of land, but so limiting the quantity of land, as to give the cheapest land a market value that would have the effect of compelling labourers to work some considerable time for wages before they could become landowners. A price that did less than this, would be insufficient; one that did more, would be excessive: the price that would do this and no more, is the proper price. I am used to call it the sufficient price.

The sufficient price has never yet been adopted by a colonizing government. The government of the United States, whose sole object in disposing of new land by sale instead of grant, was to hinder official favouritism and jobbing, has never required a higher price than two dollars an acre; and for a long while past, its price has been only one dollar and a quarter an acre. In our colonies, the price has varied from five to forty shillings. That these prices are insufficient for the purpose in view, is shown by facts, and may be made plainer by a supposed case.

The facts consist of the economical impediments to colonization which I have described before, and which have been as vigorous under the plan of selling as under that of granting. The substitution by the United States of selling for granting has not in the least diminished the value of negro slaves, or the necessity in the free states of relying for the conduct of works requiring much constancy and combination of labour, on a vast immigration of such natural slaves as the poorest Irish. The scarcity of labour in our colonies has been as great and injurious since, as it was before, the imposition of a price on new land. In all our colonies, notwithstanding the price put on new land, the cheapest land has been so cheap that the poorest class (for in a colony nobody is quite poor) could readily obtain land of their own: in all the colonies they have done this; and everywhere accordingly labour for hire has been so scarce, that it was dangerous, often fatal, for the capitalist to engage in any work requiring the constant employment of many pairs of hands.

I must here explain, however, that in most of our colonies the price would have been inoperative if it had been ten times as high as it was. In Canada and New South Wales, for example, land had been granted with such reckless profusion

before the plan of selling was adopted, that if this plan had even, by means of an enormous price, put an end to the acquisition of new land, it would still have had no effect on the land and labour markets. The quantity of land in proportion to people was already so great as to occasion practically an unlimited supply, whilst the demand could only increase by the slow progress of births and immigration. In these two colonies, therefore, as in others where the plan of granting was once profusely carried into effect, the cheapest land has been as cheap since, as it was before, the imposition of a price on new land; and in each of these colonies, a price on new land, however high it might be, would remain inoperative for ages to come. In such colonies, the mere putting of a price on new land only operates as a restriction on the use of newly discovered spots highly favourable for settlement, and as a tax upon colonization; the very last sort of tax that a colonizing government would think of imposing.

How a price on new land might be rendered beneficially operative in colonies where the quantity of private land is already excessive, is a point to be considered presently. Here I would remark that there are but three places in which the price of new land has had the least chance of operating beneficially. These are South Australia, Australia Felix, and New Zealand. In none of these cases did the plan of granting with profusion precede that of selling; but in none of them did the price required prevent the cheapest land from being cheap enough to inflict on the colony all the evils of an extreme scarcity of labour for hire. In these cases, moreover, a large portion of the purchase-money of waste land was expended in conveying labourers from the mother-country to the colony. If this money had not been so spent, the proportion of land to people would have been very much greater than it was, and the price of new land still more completely inoperative.

More facts might be cited to show the insufficiency of the highest price yet required for new land; but I proceed to the supposed case, which I think serves to illustrate this subject better than the small stock of not very conclusive facts, which are furnished by the brief and bungling trial in practice of the plan of imposing a price on waste land with a view to the greatest productiveness of colonial industry. Suppose, then, that Liebig should discover a process by which the water of the sea might be converted into fertile land, at a cost of, let us say forty shillings an acre. Suppose, further, that the state did

not monopolize the exercise of this art, but allowed a free trade in it. Immense capitals would be invested in this trade. The quantity of sea converted into land would be as much as there was a prospect of being able to sell for the cost of production and a profit besides. A remunerating price would not exceed fifty shillings an acre; that is, forty to cover outlay, and ten for profit. At this price, fertile land might be obtained in unlimited quantities. In this country, including the new territory, the price of the cheapest land would not exceed fifty shillings an acre. Population might increase as fast as it could, but the price of the cheapest land would not rise. Some of the cheapest would become dear, and even the dearest, in consequence of competition for it when the progress of settlement had conferred on it certain advantages of position: but there would always be plenty of land on sale at the price of fifty shillings. Call on your imagination to conceive what would happen. Is it not clear that pauperism, as that arises from superabundance of people in proportion to land, would entirely disappear? The demand for labour in the cultivation of the new land would draw away all superfluous hands from the old parts of the country; and we should be no more troubled with pauperism in England than they are in colonies. Wages in England would be as high as in America. But these blessings would be accompanied, or rather succeeded, by a set of curses. The passion for owning land, which belongs to human nature, which is latent when there is no opportunity of gratifying it, but surely breaks out in the majority of people whenever it can be easily gratified, would become as active here as it is in America and other colonial parts of the world: for with a colonial rate of wages, and with fertile land always on sale at the price of fifty shillings an acre, every man who desired it might easily gratify the longing to become a landowner. The utmost effect of such a price as fifty shillings an acre, would be to compel the labourer to work for wages a little longer than if he could get land for nothing. But this would not prevent a scarcity of labour for hire nearly as great as that which takes place in America. It follows that not instantly, but very soon after getting rid of pauperism, and seeing our labouring classes as well off as those classes are in America, we should begin to complain of scarcity of labour for hire. How quickly and perfectly we should find out the value of combination and constancy of labour! In a little while, how glad we should be to divert the stream of poor Irish emigration from America to

England: that is, provided the Irish, being able to get new land for fifty shillings an acre close at home, would come to England as aliens and natural slaves; which they would not. We should ere long, I suspect, unless our climate were an objection to it, begin to hanker after negro slavery. We should certainly, in order to get large public works performed at all, keep our own convicts at home. We should be, as it were, colonists, continually suffering all sorts of inconvenience and discomfort from the scarcity of labour for hire. But we should find out quickly enough, in the case supposed, that scarcity of labour for hire is caused by cheapness of land. With the exception of the small proportion of the people who in the case supposed would be labourers for hire, every man would be palpably interested in making land dearer: even the labourers would have the same interest, though it would be a little more remote, and therefore, perhaps, much less obvious. In all probability, therefore, we should pass a law for making land dearer. This would be the easiest thing in the world to do. It would be done by putting a price upon new land over and above the cost of production. This price would be a mere tax, a useless, and therefore hurtful impediment to the acquisition of new land, unless, along with the cost of production, it were high enough for its only legitimate purpose. In the colonies, there is no cost of production. There, the whole good effect must be produced by a price imposed by government, or not produced at all. The supposed case, as I have stated it, must contain some grave errors of reasoning, if fifty shillings would be a sufficient price to require for new land in the colonies.

LETTER XLVII. FROM THE STATESMAN

Mr. Mothercountry taunts the colonist with being unable to say what would be the sufficient price for new land.

I am beginning to understand your plan of colonization as respects the disposal of land; but a difficulty has been suggested to me by my Mr. Mothercountry, which I hasten to communicate to you. He says, that though you have been preaching for years about the sufficient price, you have never ventured to say what it ought to be. He says that you have been frequently asked to mention what you deem the sufficient price, but that you have carefully avoided answering the question. He says that you fight shy of the question; that it puzzles you;

that in truth you know not how to answer it; and that your silence on this point shows (I beg your pardon for even communicating the offensive inference) that you know your theory to be impracticable: for, he adds, what becomes of all the fine arguments for a sufficient price, if nobody, not even the author of the theory, can tell us what is the sufficient price? He referred me to an article in the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1840, for proof that your theory is wanting in the scientific precision which you attribute to it.

I dare say you have heard all this before; but even so, the repetition of it now will recal the subject to your mind at the fittest stage of our inquiry: for, obviously, our next step is to determine the sufficient price. I am curious to see how you will reply to Mr. Mothercountry's *argumentum ad hominem*.

LETTER XLIX. FROM THE COLONIST

The colonist replies to Mr. Mothercountry's taunt, indicates the elements of a calculation for getting at the sufficient price, and refers to Mr. Stephen and the *Edinburgh Review*.

It is quite true that I have been frequently and tauntingly required to mention what I deem the sufficient price. But I have hitherto avoided falling into the trap, which that demand upon me really is. I might have named a price, and stuck to it without giving reasons: in other words. I might have practised a Colonial-Office "shift" by "deciding categorically, so as not to expose the superficiality in propounding the reasons": or I might have named a price, and attempted to justify the decision by reasons: but in the one case, your Mr. Mothercountry would have been entitled to call me a charlatan, and in the other a goose. For there is no price that would be suitable for the colonies generally: the price must needs vary according to peculiar natural and other circumstances *in each colony*: and in order to determine the price for any colony, practical proceedings of a tentative or experimental nature are indispensable. If so, what a mess I should have got into, had I responded to the taunting call of Mr. Mothercountry and his allies!

That it is so becomes very plain, when one considers what are the elements of a calculation made with a view of determining the sufficient price for any colony. There is but one object of a price and about that there can be no mistake. **The sole** object of a price, is to prevent labourers **from** turning **into**

landowners too soon: the price must be sufficient for that one purpose and no other. The question is, what price would have that one effect? That must depend, first, on what is meant by "too soon"; or on the proper duration of the term of the labourer's employment for hire; which again must depend on the rate of the increase of population in the colony, especially by means of immigration, which would determine when the place of a labourer, turning into a landowner, would be filled by another labourer: and the rate of labour-emigration again must depend on the popularity of the colony at home, and on the distance between the mother-country and the colony, or the cost of passage for labouring people. Secondly, what price would have the desired effect, must depend on the rate of wages and cost of living in the colony; since according to these would be the labourer's power of saving the requisite capital for turning into a landowner: in proportion to the rate of wages and the cost of living, would the requisite capital be saved in a longer or a shorter time. It depends, thirdly, on the soil and climate of the colony, which would determine the quantity of land required (on the average) by a labourer in order to set himself up as a landowner: if the soil and climate were unfavourable to production, he would require more acres; if it were favourable, fewer acres would serve his purpose: in Trinidad, for example, 10 acres would support him well; in South Africa or New South Wales, he might require 50 or 100 acres. But the variability in our wide colonial empire, not only of soil and climate, but of all the circumstances on which a sufficient price would depend, is so obvious, that no examples of it are needed. It follows of course that different colonies, and sometimes different groups of similar colonies, would require different prices. To name a price for all the colonies, would be as absurd as to fix the size of a coat for mankind.

"But at least," I hear your Mr. Mothercountry say, "name a price for some particular colony; a price founded on the elements of calculation which you have stated." I could do that certainly for some colony with which I happen to be particularly well acquainted; but I should do it doubtingly and with hesitation: for in truth the elements of calculation are so many and so complicated in their various relations to each other, that in depending on them exclusively there would be the utmost liability to error. A very complete and familiar knowledge of them in each case would be a useful general guide, would throw valuable light on the question, would serve to

inform the legislator how far his theory and his practice were consistent or otherwise: but in the main he must rely, and if he had common sagacity he might solely and safely rely, upon no very elaborate calculation, but on experience, or the facts before his face. He could always tell whether or not labour for hire was too scarce or too plentiful in the colony. If it were too plentiful, he would know that the price of new land was too high; that is, more than sufficient: if it were hurtfully scarce, he would know that the price was too low, or not sufficient. About which the labour was—whether too plentiful or too scarce—no legislature, hardly any individual, could be in doubt; so plain to the dullest eye would be the facts by which to determine that question. If the lawgiver saw that the labour was scarce and the price too low, he would raise the price: if he saw that labour was superabundant and the price too high, he would lower the price: if he saw that labour was neither scarce nor superabundant, he would not alter the price, because he would see that it was neither too high nor too low, but sufficient. Recurring to the supposed discovery of Liebig, the legislature of this country would always be able to judge whether new land was supplied too fast, or not fast enough, or at the rate of a happy medium between excess and deficiency. The evidence on which the legislature would form its judgment, would be all the facts which show whether labour is scarce, or superabundant, or neither one nor the other. Whether here or in a colony, these facts are so very manifest, and so unerring as indications, that a wrong conclusion from them would be hardly possible. Only, of course, I am supposing that the legislature of the colony would possess an intimate knowledge of the colony, and would be deeply interested in coming to a right judgment: a Downing-street legislature judging for the distant colonies, or a distant colonial legislature judging for us, would indeed, notwithstanding the patent nature of the guiding facts, be apt to make terrible mistakes.

The raising or lowering of the price according to the evidence of a necessity for either step, is what I called just now a tentative or experimental proceeding. In either case, the legislature would have to wait and see whether the alteration produced the desired effect. But there is an objection to lowering the price, which makes it desirable, that the legislature, in trying its experiments, should begin with a price obviously too low, and should raise the price by careful degrees so as to run little risk of ever making it too high. The objection to ever lowering

the price is, that whenever this was done, some of those who had purchased at the higher price, would complain that they had been made to pay more than their successors, and more than was necessary. It would be by no means certain that they really had paid more than was necessary at the time of their purchase: for the circumstances of the colony at that time might have required that price, for the greatest good of those purchasers as well as of the whole colony. Nor, if new circumstances required a lower price — such a circumstance, for example, as a great spontaneous and unexpected immigration of labour into the colony, which suddenly and greatly increased the proportion of people to appropriated land—would these earlier purchasers at the higher price suffer any injustice from a lowering of the price. They might suffer hardship, but no injustice. If the higher price had been kept up so long after it became too high, as to confer on land the monopoly value which arises from scarcity, then, when the price of new land was lowered, the general value of appropriated land would decline; and the amount of its fall would be so much loss to all landowners. This would be a hardship: but, for two reasons, it would not be an injustice. All landowners would have purchased with a full knowledge of the wish and intention of the legislature to lower the price whenever population should be superabundant, or if, after a trial, it should appear too high; nobody would have been deceived or misled: and secondly, the monopoly value of land which had been created by keeping up too high a price, though a benefit to the landowner, would be a benefit, which as accruing to him against the will of the legislature and contrary to his own expectations when he purchased, and as being a wrong to the community at large, ought justly to be taken from him as soon as possible. Injustice, therefore, there would be none in lowering the price. I have said that the scarcity value conferred on land by too high a price would be a benefit to the landowner; but this was only said for argument's sake: for in truth, a colony in which appropriated land was kept at a scarcity value, would be a most unpopular colony in the mother country; and its landowners would miss the benefits enjoyed by the landowners of a colony into which there pours a constant stream of capital as well as people. The landowners, in the supposed case, would obtain a scarcity-value for their land, similar to that which takes place in Tipperary; but they would miss a position-value, so to speak, like that which occurs in Lancashire: they would lose more than

they would gain. Upon the whole, therefore, it appears to me, that purchasers at a higher price would surfer neither injustice nor hardship by a lowering of the price when this step became expedient for the good of the whole colony. But in consideration of our proneness to be jealous and envious of our neighbours, I would guard, if possible, against even the appearance of *giving* an advantage to the later purchaser. I think, therefore, that the colonizing legislature ought to begin with a price clearly too low, and to raise the price by degrees with a cautious but resolute hand.

If your Mr. Mothercountry should say that a system which requires, in at least one of its processes, the exercise of much caution and resolution, is not a self-adjusting system, but one liable to be deranged by human infirmity, and therefore one not to be relied upon, I would answer, nobody has ever attributed to it that magical property of being able to work itself without legislative or administrative care, which its official opponents, in order to decry it, have represented that its advocates claimed for it. The article in the *Edinburgh Review* was written by a gentleman, then a clerk in the Colonial Office, and a friend of Mr. Stephen's, the permanent Under-Secretary. Mr. Stephen's influence with that eminent journal has been used to prevent the circulation of favourable views of the theory, as well as to circulate hostile views. Two habitual contributors to the *Review* offered to its editor, the late Professor Napier, at different times, and without each other's knowledge or mine, two' articles, of which the object was to explain and recommend the theory; but he declined to insert either, on the ground, in the one case, of having pledged the *Review* to the opinions of Mr. Stephen's friend; and, in the other, of his unwillingness to displease Mr. Stephen. To save trouble, in case you should mention this to your Mr. Mothercountry, I add that though Professor Napier is no more, the two gentlemen in question are alive, and in full recollection of the facts.

Thus, you see, the whining of colonial Downing-street, about being debarred from communication with the public, is not founded in fact. No other public department has better, nay equal, means of using the anonymous press for defence and attack. I almost wish now, that this peculiarity of the Colonial Office had. been described under the head of government.

LETTER L. FROM THE COLONIST

Selling waste land by auction with a view to obtaining the sufficient price by means of competition, is either a foolish conceit or a false pretence.

It has been imagined that the sufficient price might be obtained by means of competition, if new land were offered for sale by auction at a low upset price. I am at a loss to conceive how this notion could be entertained by a reasonable mind. If the quantity of land were practically unlimited, there would be no competition, except for spots possessing some advantage of position; and spots of land for which there would be competition, are just those for which the poorest class of buyers, or the labourers, would not bid: they would buy only that land for which there was no competition, and which, therefore, they would obtain at the upset price. It follows, that unless the quantity of land offered for sale were limited, it would be necessary, under a system of sales by auction, to make the upset price a sufficient price: the necessity of determining a sufficient price would be just the same as if the land were sold at a fixed uniform price without auction. Unquestionably, if the quantity of land offered for sale were sufficiently limited, there would be competition for all new land; and the lowest price obtained would exceed the upset price in proportion to the degree of limitation. But in order to obtain this result, the government must needs determine what degree of limitation would produce enough competition to make the lowest selling price a sufficient price. The sufficient price would still be determined by the government, but by means of a sufficient limitation of the quantity offered for sale. By limiting the quantity, as has been shown before, the government might determine the price of the cheapest land in the colony, without putting any price on new land, or under the plan of granting. The government, that is, might do this provided limitation of quantity were practically susceptible of being made a regulator of price. But practically, as has been explained before, limitation of quantity could not be used by the government as an efficient regulator of price; and again, if it were so used, its operation would be wholly independent of selling by auction, since if there were no auction, but the land given for nothing, the lowest price of land in the colony would be sufficient if the limitation of the quantity of granted land were sufficient. Selling by auction, indeed, may serve other purposes than that of determining the sufficient

price by means of competition; but when employed for this purpose, which it cannot serve, it is a self-delusion or a cheat; a fancied means of doing what it cannot do, or a make-believe of doing what is not done. In the United States, they sell by auction; but the quantity offered for sale being practically unlimited, the upset price is the usual selling price. In our colonies, very great prices have been obtained by means of selling at auction certain spots which were supposed likely to enjoy, ere long, great advantages of position; but the obtaining of these great prices for some land had not the slightest effect on the lowest price of land in the colony: that did not exceed the lowest price at which land could be obtained at the auction sales; namely, the upset price. I must not omit, however, to mention that one or two cases have happened in which the lowest price obtained by auction considerably exceeded the upset price. The result was brought about by offering for sale less land than was wanted by buyers at that time and place: some competition for all the land was really produced, but solely by means of limiting the quantity offered for sale. In these cases, however, great evils arose from the attempt of the government to determine prices by limitation of quantity. The accidental or arbitrary limitation was not, and could not have been, continued; and when a less limitation took place—when more land was afterwards offered for sale than was wanted by intending buyers at the time and place—the lowest price of land fell; and the buyers at the first sales discovered that the government had induced them to pay a price higher than that which others now paid, or for which they could now sell their land. These cases, in which auction did produce competition for all the land put up to sale, exemplify the inadequacy and unsuitableness of competition produced by limitation of quantity as a means of getting at the sufficient price. The experience furnished by the United States and our colonies, agrees with the reasoning, which shows, that selling by auction for the alleged purpose of obtaining the sufficient price, is either a foolish conceit or a false pretence.

By looking to the papers that your Mr. Mothercountry sent to you at an early state of our correspondence, with the passages marked which exhibit colonial hostility to what he called my "scheme," you will find that the colonists, especially in New South Wales, bitterly complain of the plan of selling public land by auction. Their objections to it are identical with mine, as you will see by my next letter.

LETTER LI. FROM THE COLONIST

Further objections to the plan of selling waste land by auction.
—Advantages of a fixed uniform price.

There are seven other and very grave objections to the plan of selling by auction.

1. Auction fails altogether in its object unless, by means of competition, it produces for some land a higher price than the upset price. Supposing the upset price to be a sufficient price as regards scarcity of labour, then all that auction produces, above that price is so much capital unnecessarily taken from the settlers. If, by means of the upset price, care is taken that nobody obtains land for less than the sufficient price, then all excess above that price is a useless and mischievous tax on colonization. More than the sufficient price, the government never ought to obtain by any means. When, further, the government does obtain by means of competition at auction more than the sufficient price, the excess is the profit on his investment which the settler would have made if he had bought at the upset price: and the government, instead of letting this profit go into the pocket of the settler sooner or later after the sale, puts it into its own pocket at the time of the sale. Now, one of the greatest encouragements of colonization is the prospect which the settler has of making a profit by his investment in the purchase of land. First, then, by unnecessarily diminishing the capital of the settler even before he begins to settle, and, secondly, by depriving him of the prospect of enjoying himself the benefit of future competition for his land, the government, when it effectually sells by auction, very effectually discourages the emigration of capitalists and impedes the progress of colonization.

2. In order that auction should be effectual, time must be given for the growth of competition: a sale by auction, whether in this country or in a colony, would be absurd without ample notice by advertisement. Intending purchasers, therefore, must wait some time for the announced day of sale. But for settlers, and especially for new emigrants, all waiting is full of mischief, being the parent of idleness, inertness, and despondency; often of hard-drinking, to drown the care of suspense and hope delayed. No tongue can tell what injury this waiting for a sale by auction has inflicted on settlers in our newest colonies.

3. As well before as after the government has declared its

intention of laying a district open to purchase, intending purchasers take great pains, and incur no little trouble and cost, in selecting the spots of land which, for some reason or other, generally on account of their peculiar suitableness to the settlers' purpose, they prefer to other spots. When the sale takes place, therefore, many an intending purchaser is bent on obtaining a particular lot or lots. This at least would always happen if the land were not sold by auction. For when it is sold by auction, the intending purchaser of a particular lot is apt to be outbid beyond his means. When this happens (and nothing is more common), the settler does not realize his choice at all: the time, and exertion, and money which he has spent on selection, are thrown away, and he has to repeat the process, with very likely the same result over again. At last, perhaps, the settler is deprived of all freedom of choice, being compelled to take land which he does not prefer, or to which he has strong objections. I suspect that this occurs in even a majority of cases. How the probability, or only the risk of it, must discourage the attendance of intending purchasers at auction sales, is sufficiently obvious.

4. In his anxiety to obtain the land on which his heart is set, the settler is apt to bid beyond his means; and when the lot is knocked down to him, he is incapable of using it. The impoverishment of the settler by means of obtaining the lot which he has selected, is a common occurrence: the utter ruin of settlers by this means is not very uncommon.

5. Under the auction plan, the honest industrious settler is liable to be plundered by jobbing and roguery of various sorts. The official surveyors, by means of information obtained whilst they were making the survey, have it in their power to job; and under our system of colonial government, official surveyors are capable of jobbing in the very souls of their parents and children. Officials of all sorts who can obtain from the surveyors' reports superior information as to the varying qualities of the land, can job if they please, and do job most woefully. The speculating capitalist can job, by means of his command of money. The *bond fide* settler, the man ready and anxious to lay out his money in land and improvements upon it, has to buy off these harpies. Often, when his means are insufficient for that purpose, they sell him the land on credit at an exorbitant price, and ruin him by means of the heavy interest. In America, the inherent evils of mere jobbing at the auction sales are moderated by an occasional administration of Lynch law: a

speculator who attends the sale for the mere purpose of harassing and so robbing the good settler, runs some risk of being shot; besides, in America, where the great quantity of land always offered for sale prevents competition save for peculiarly eligible spots, the inherent evils of jobbing at auction sales are less than in our colonies. There, the quantity having been generally limited with an express view to competition, and the auction plan not having lasted long enough to suggest the employment of Lynch law, mere jobbing in public land at the auction sales has been a cruel oppression of the settler class.

6. Competition at auction-sales gives rise to unneighbourly and vindictive feelings among the settlers. The man who is partially ruined by a neighbour's running him up at a sale, never forgets the injury, and his children inherit the rancour so occasioned. The auction sales in our colonies have produced a large stock of envious and revengeful passions in many a neighbourhood, where, colonization being the business of the people, feelings of kindness and a disposition to help one's neighbour would be sedulously encouraged by a really colonizing government.

7. And lastly, the plan of auction is very unpopular in the colonies, excepting of course amongst the harpy class, who by means of it prey on the class of true colonists. To the class of true colonists it is invariably and grievously hurtful. They continually and loudly complain of it; and the maintenance of it in spite of their complaints is a most offensive and tyrannical exercise of the despotic authority by which our colonies are governed.

Continually for years, these reasons against auction have been pressed on the notice of the Colonial Office, and especially of the present Colonial Minister, but without the least effect; or rather, I should say, with only a bad effect. For Lord Grey, who is the parent of the auction nuisance in our colonies, loves it as a mother does her rickety child, all the more when its deformities are pointed out. His affection for it has at length become so strong, that arguments against it put him into a rage; and to all such arguments he virtually replies, never by counter-arguments, if any such there are, but by expressions of sulky obstinacy which remind one of the American help's answer to the bell—"the more you ring, the more I won't come." And such things can be, because, unavoidably, there is no public in this country that cares about the colonies.

The mode of selling to which auction has been preferred, is

that of allowing settlers to take land at pleasure on paying a fixed uniform price, which should of course be the sufficient price. The price being sufficient, fixed, and uniform, the settler would pay to the government the purchase money of as many acres as he wanted, and would take the land without further ado. He would pay the sufficient price, but no more. He would retain for use the whole of his capital, except the indispensable price of his land. Whatever increased value future competition might put upon his land, would belong to him. Land-buying—in other words emigration and settlement—would thus be greatly promoted. The settler would not be kept waiting an hour for anything, after having chosen the spot of land he would best like to acquire. He would realize his own choice, without being injured or harassed, or even frightened by jobbing speculators. Nothing would happen to disturb his kindly feelings towards his neighbour; and he would not, for anything in the mode of selling public land, hate his government. The plan of a fixed and uniform price is free from all the objections to auction.

You will ask how, with a fixed and uniform price, competition between two or more settlers for the same piece of land, would be determined. By letting first come be first served. The man who first paid his purchase-money into the land-office and designated the spot of his choice, would get that spot, though a hundred men should afterwards apply for it. The hundred would be told that it was already sold. But two or more men might apply for the same spot at the same time: yes, possibly in the abstract, but really almost never, if, as clearly ought to be the case, the quantity of land always open to purchasers were so ample as to be practically unlimited. Now and then, however, such a thing might happen as two or more men entering the land-office at the same moment and applying for the same spot. On the occurrence of this rare event, the competition would be determined by letting the applicants draw lots for the preference. This mode of determining the competition is so simple and so perfectly fair, that nobody could mistake its operation, or feel that it had done him the least injustice. But there are objectors, official advocates of auction, with Lord Grey at their head, who say that drawing lots for the preference would be a lottery, and would promote a spirit of gambling amongst purchasers. The reply is, first, that the occasion for drawing lots would scarcely ever happen; secondly, that even if it happened frequently, it would

not, operate like a lottery, because the necessity of having recourse to it would occur accidentally, without design on the part of the competitors, and the competition would not last five minutes; thirdly, that if a gambling spirit were promoted by the frequent drawing of lots among competitors for the same piece of land at the same moment, the evil would be incalculably less than that of all the villainies and cruelties of the auction, which is the only possible alternative of the fixed price. But in practice, I repeat, the drawing of lots would hardly ever occur; and when it did, it would be wanting in those properties of a lottery which cultivate the gambling spirit. The lottery argument against a fixed price¹ is of that class, which Single-speech Hamilton advises us to employ when we want to give an odious appearance to the proposal of our adversary.

I must point out, however, that although, as a rule, two people would hardly ever apply for the same bit of land at the same moment, exceptional occasions do arise in which the drawing of lots does partake in some measure of the gambling character of a lottery. This happens when a considerable number of people are about to emigrate for the purpose of planting a new settlement, and when they pay here a fixed price per acre for land that they have not seen. They pay not for land, but for a right to take land when they reach the colony. In the exercise of this right, it would be impossible to adopt the principle of first come first served; because all the purchasers have already come; they are all present together; and every one of them wishes to have first choice in the selection of land. An order of choice, therefore, must be determined somehow. For the right to choose pieces of land, out of a quantity which the purchaser has not yet seen, experience has proved, as a moments reflection would suggest, that people cannot be induced to bid against each other at auction: either they will not buy at all, or they will only pay a price not exceeding what they believe will be the value of the least valuable spot of the land to be hereafter distributed amongst them. This must necessarily be a known, fixed and uniform price. When they have paid this price, the question arises, who is to choose first, who second, and so on? If anybody knows how this question can be determined with perfect fairness to all parties, except by letting the purchasers draw lots for priority of choice, he has discovered what has escaped the earnest research of many ingenious minds. According to our present knowledge, we must either use this method of determining priority of choice, or we must renounce

the practice—a practice which has founded South Australia and four Settlements in New Zealand—of founding settlements by means of selling land in this country to the first body of intending colonists. That in such case the drawing of lots is a kind of lottery, is obvious; but it is a lottery without blanks, however high the prizes may be; and finally, so far as there is evil in it, it is like many other cases in which priorities are determined by lot, or, like most of the steps which man takes with a view to good results, an imperfect means of doing what could not be done with as little admixture of evil, or perhaps at all, by any other means. This, I suppose, is the view of the subject taken by the Archbishop of Canterbury who, as president of the new association for founding a settlement in New Zealand, has given his high moral sanction to the plan of drawing lots in cases of necessity.

LETTER LII. FROM THE COLONIST

Lord Grey's confusion of ideas respecting the objects with which a price should be required for new land.—Another objection to a uniform price for waste land, with the colonist's answer to it.

The uniformity of a fixed price has been objected to, on several grounds.

First, says Lord Grey, as land is of different qualities with respect to fertility and the probability of future advantages of position, it ought to fetch different prices. Why "ought"? The only reason given is the "woman's reason"—"Because it ought." What does "ought" mean in this case? Do we owe any duty to the land, that commands us to make it fetch different prices because it varies in quality? Is there any person to whom we owe this duty? Verily, if we were selling land in this country—either our own land for ourselves, or somebody else's land for him, or crown land for the public—we should be bound to obtain the highest possible price, and of course to require a higher price for the more valuable portions. But that is because in this country, all the land being appropriated, the sole object in selling always is to get the highest price: whereas in a colony, under the circumstances in question, the object would be only to get the sufficient price; and it would be an important object to avoid taking more than that out of any buyer's pocket. Confusion of ideas is at the bottom of all these notions about the expediency of auction, or some other

way of getting a price for colonial waste land in proportion to its present or probable value. The totally different circumstances of the colony and the old country—the totally different objects with which landed property is sold here and would be sold there—are so confounded in Lord Grey's mind, that he unconsciously applies old-country rules to the colonial question. His "ought" really means that selling land for its market value is the only mode of selling land, as respects both objects and means, to which his mind is accustomed, and which he is able to comprehend. With equal truth, a predecessor of his might have written to the Governor of Upper Canada, "I send you water casks for the fleet on Ontario, because my familiar ideas on the subjects of fleets and water assure me that all water which bears a fleet must be salt." On further reflection, it is rather to ignorance about the colonies—to the absence of colonial ideas at the Colonial Office—than to official confusion of colonial and old-country ideas, that such unhappy mistakes would be most justly attributed.

The second objection to a uniform price is, that if the price were sufficient, land of very inferior quality, as respects either fertility or position, would not be bought at all. Certainly it would not be bought if it were so inferior as to be, according to the market value of the cheapest land in the colony, worth less than the sufficient price. But the inferiority of position would not last long. The progress of settlement around and beyond such neglected spots, would soon confer advantages of position upon them. Roads would be made near or through them. Population and the average value of land would increase around them. In time, unless they were so sterile by nature as to be what we term here land not worth reclaiming, new facilities of improving them—of conveying all sorts of things between them and the town—and the increased value of all land in their neighbourhood, would make them worth the sufficient price; and then they would be bought. Meanwhile, they would be used for pasturage: for, as I shall explain presently, it is contrary to the principle of a sufficient price for freehold land, to put any price upon the use of land for pasturage only. But if these spots were so sterile and so out of the way, like the barren tops of mountains, as not to be worth cultivating under any circumstances, they would never be sold, but always used, if fit even for that, as runs for cattle and sheep during the time of year when some grass will grow almost everywhere except on bare rock. If they were not even fit for that, they would

never be used at all. And what then? Why, these barren, out-of-the-way spots would only resemble similar spots in old countries, which nature has condemned to uselessness for ages. To perpetual uselessness, nature has probably not condemned a morsel of the earth's surface. But now, observe that the time at which land of inferior fertility and position increased in value, would come very much sooner, and the degree of increased value for the worst of such land would be much greater, under a plan of colonization which made labour plentiful, than under the usual scarcity of labour. Roads would come sooner and be more numerous; the cost of reclaiming waste land would be less, not in consequence of lower wages (for wages might be higher with than without the more productive employment of labour), but in consequence of the greater power of combined and constant labour; and the proportion of non-agricultural classes to the agricultural class—or, in other words, the number of local customers for the sellers of landed produce—would be very much greater than it is now in any colony. Upon the whole, then, it seems probable that if no land could be got for less than the sufficient price, inferior land would become worth that price sooner than, with scarcity of labour, it becomes worth cultivating at all. If so, this objection to a uniform price is converted into a recommendation: and if not, it is still not a valid objection to the uniform price as part of a system, except on the unreasonable supposition that inferior land would probably be cultivated sooner under a system which makes the cheapest land worth at market hardly anything, than under one which would make all appropriated land worth at least the sufficient price.

LETTER LUI. FROM THE COLONIST

With a sufficient price for new land, profits and wages would be higher, and exports greater, than without it.

Some probable effects of the sufficient price must be briefly noticed, before I come to two of them which demand particular explanation.

At first sight, it appears that wages would be lower and profits higher than when land was superabundant and labour scarce, because, of the whole produce of capital and labour, the capitalist would pay less to the labourer and keep more for himself: a greater competition for employment amongst the

labourers, **no** longer able to acquire land with great facility, would bring down wages and raise profits. And this would really happen if the productiveness of industry remained unaltered. But, really, inasmuch as the productiveness of industry would be increased (to what extent one cannot tell, because what the energetic and intelligent, as well as combined and constant labour of freemen can do with the virgin soils of a new country has never yet been tried); inasmuch as the produce to be divided between the capitalist and the labourer would be greater, both parties might obtain more than when that produce was less. At all events, there would be far more to divide. If the competition of labourers for employment enabled the capitalist to keep the whole increase for himself, the labourers would be dissatisfied, and the colony would become unpopular with the labouring class at home; when it would be seen that the competition of labourers in this colony was too great, and the price of new land more than sufficient. The produce being greater, it would always be for the advantage of capitalists and the whole colony, that such a share of the increase should go to the labourer, as would keep the colony popular with the labouring class at home; and this would always be secured, by taking care that the competition of labourers for employment was never too great; in other words, that the price of new land was never more than sufficient.

The produce of industry being greater in consequence of the new facilities for combining labour, dividing employments, and carrying on works which require long time for their completion, everybody in the colony would be richer: and the colony being able to export and import more, would be a better customer of the mother-country.

Nevertheless, I suppose you to ask, although the sufficient price prevented labourers from too soon turning into land-owners, how would enough labourers be obtained? The sufficient price does not provide for immigration of labour. If the colony could depend for labour upon nothing but the increase of people by births on the spot, it would be requisite to make the sufficient price of land high enough to keep wages down to an old-country rate, and to prevent most labourers from ever becoming landowners. A colony so near to England as Canada, might obtain labourers by the immigration of poor people at their own cost; but what would become of the more distant colonies, South Africa, the four Australias, Tasmania, and New Zealand? In the latter places, the colonization, or

gradual settlement of the waste, would be of a good sort, but would be extremely slow. The sufficient price alone, provides only for civilized, not for rapid colonization.

I answer, that the sufficient price, by itself, would provide for a more rapid colonization than has ever been seen in the world. So bold an assertion requires careful proof. This rapidity of colonization in consequence of the sufficient price is the first of those effects of the sufficient price which demand particular explanation. I must, however, reserve it for another letter.

LETTER LIV. FROM THE COLONIST

With a sufficient price for waste land, capitalists would obtain labour by means of paying for the emigration of poor people.

The price being sufficient to prevent labourers from turning into landowners too soon, it would now be worth the while of capitalists to procure labour from the mother-country at their own cost; it would "pay" emigrating capitalists to take out labourers along with them. And why? Because now, all labourers being under the necessity of remaining labourers for some years, it would be possible, and not difficult, for capitalists to enforce contracts for labour made in the mother-country. Referring to a former letter, the temptation of the labourer to quit the employer who had brought him to the colony, would be no longer irresistible. With the very high rate of wages that the importing employer of labour could afford to pay, provided he could keep the labour he imported, the cost of the labourer's passage would be, as the saying is, a mere flea-bite; an entity hardly worth taking into the calculation of his outgoings and incomings. The difference between the wages that the importing and the non-importing capitalist could afford to pay, would be so slight as to be without practical effect. The importing capitalist would be able, without feeling it, to pay the same wages as the non-importing capitalist, and would be better able to keep the labourers he imported, by treating them with kindness and consideration for their human pride as well as their physical wants, than the other would be to entice them away by the promise of such treatment. In most cases, therefore, the non-importing capitalist would become an importing one: when it had become easy to keep imported labour, the motives for importing labour, instead of enticing it away from one's neighbour who had imported it, would be strong enough,

in the great majority of instances, to abolish the temptation to this kind of robbery: and if some would-be robbers remained, they would be prevented by the frowns of society from doing so great a wrong to their neighbour for so small a gain to themselves. Upon the whole, therefore, I think that the inducements to the importation of labour by capitalists would be as great as they are in Brazil and Cuba; perhaps greater, if we consider the superiority of free to slave labour, as respects the power of production. At the least, there would be a great deal of inducement of the same kind, in regard to the paying by capitalists for the passage of labourers, as that which, if no impediments were put in the way of its operations, would probably, land continuing dirt cheap and labour for hire almost unknown in America, convey a million of negro slaves from Africa to America in the course of every year. If free imported labour could be kept in our colonies, I can see no limit to the probable amount of labour-emigration by means of the payment of the labourer's passage by his future employer. For the importers of labour, in the case supposed, would be not only capitalists within the colony, but capitalists emigrating to the colony, who, feeling that they should be able to enforce in the colony a contract for labour made at home, would take along with them the labour which they expected to require, and would send for more if more should be required: and assuredly, the economical attraction of being able to keep labour for hire in the colonies, would (provided always the political evils were removed) lead to an emigration of capitalists and capital, to the extent of which it would be difficult to assign a probable limit. If labourers and capitalists poured into the colony at the rate which seems probable under the circumstances supposed, colonization would be very rapid as well as good in kind, or civilized: and the sole cause of the whole improvement would be the sufficient price.

LETTER LV. FROM THE COLONIST

The sufficient price produces money incidentally.—What should be done with the purchase-money of new land?—Several effects of using the purchase-money as a fund for defraying the cost of emigration.

I proceed to the second effect of the sufficient price, which requires particular explanation.

The sufficient price would bring money into the colonial

exchequer. If it were in full operation throughout our colonies, it would produce a vast deal of money; for the sale of waste land in the United States at a price little more than nominal (45. 7½*d.* an acre) produces about a million sterling a year, and has produced, in one year of unusual speculation, as much as four millions, or more than the whole annual expenditure of the federal government at that time. The question arises then, what should be done with the money produced by the sufficient price? And in the whole art of colonization, there is no question of more importance.

The putting of money into the colonial exchequer would not have been designed by the government. The getting of money by the government would be a result of selling land instead of giving it away: but as the only object of selling instead of giving is one totally distinct from that of producing revenue—namely, to prevent labourers from turning into landowners too soon—the pecuniary result would be unintended, one might almost say unexpected. So completely is production of revenue a mere incident of the price of land, that the price ought to be imposed, if it ought to be imposed under any circumstances, even though the purchase-money were thrown away. This last proposition is the sharpest test to which the theory of a sufficient price can be submitted; but if it will not stand this test—if the proposition is not true—the theory is false. Assuming *it* not to be false, the money arising from the sale of land is a fund raised without a purpose, unavoidably, incidentally, almost accidentally. It is a fund, therefore, without a destination. There would be no undertaking, no tacit obligation even, on the part of the government to dispose of the fund in any particular way. It is an unappropriated fund, which the state or government may dispose of as it pleases without injustice to anybody. If the fund were applied to paying off the public debt of the empire, nobody could complain of injustice, because every colony as a whole, and the buyers of land in particular, would still enjoy all the intended and expected benefits of the imposition of a sufficient price upon new land: if the fund were thrown into the sea as it accrued, there would still be no injustice, and no reason against producing the fund in that way.

If this reasoning is correct, the government would be at liberty to cast about for the most beneficial mode of disposing of the fund. Upon that point, I do not pretend to offer an opinion: but if the object were the utmost possible increase of the population, wealth, and greatness of our empire, then I can

THE ART OF COLONIZATION

have no doubt that the revenue accruing from the sale of waste land, would be called an emigration-fund, and be expended in conveying poor people of the labouring class from the mother-country to the colonies. Let us see what would be the principal effects of that disposition of the purchase-money of waste land.

i. It would no longer be desirable for colonial or emigrating capitalists to lay out money directly in taking labour to the colony; but they would do so indirectly when, by purchasing land, they contributed to the emigration-fund. They would see, more distinctly than if the purchase-money of land were not an emigration fund, that in paying the sufficient price for land they purchased labour as well as land; they would pay the sufficient price more cheerfully; and the working of the plan of colonization would be better understood, and the plan itself more popular, both in the colonies and in the mother-country: points of great importance with a view to getting into quick and full operation a system so novel, and so much at variance with common ideas about the disposal of waste land in colonies.

2. If the price were sufficient, even though the purchase-money should be thrown away, there would always be in the colony a supply of labour corresponding with the demand; but if the immigration of labour were only spontaneous, the progress of colonization, how much soever faster than if new land were too cheap and the capitalist had no motive for directly importing labour, would be slower than if every purchase of land *necessarily* brought labour into the colony. Colonization would be improved both in kind and pace by imposing the sufficient price; but its pace would be prodigiously accelerated by using the purchase-money as an emigration-fund. If the emigration-fund were judiciously expended, emigrating capitalists would be allowed to take out with them, free of cost, such labourers as they might expect to require in the colony. They would have indeed, when they bought waste land in the colony, to contribute to the emigration-fund; but as their land would bear a market value equal at least to what they paid for it, they would really get the labour for nothing. This, and the opportunity of selecting the labour here, would induce many a capitalist to emigrate who might not otherwise think of doing so. I am speaking now, as much from experience as from reason, having been convinced, even by very imperfect and much-impered experiments in the founding of South Australia and New Zealand, that the class of emigrating capitalists set a high value on the opportunity of engaging labourers here and taking them

out free of cost. In this way, then, both capitalists and labourers would go to the colony, in greater numbers than if the purchase-money were not used as an emigration-fund; but in how much greater numbers, experience telleth not, and would only tell when the whole system was in real and full operation after the political impediments to colonization had been removed.

3. But some notion of what would then be the rate of colonization, may be formed by observing another effect of turning purchase-money into emigration-fund. Every sale of land would produce a corresponding amount of immigration. Emigrants would pour into the colony at a rate of which there has been no example in the settlement of new countries. Some idea of what that rate would be when the plan was in full operation, may be formed by comparing what took place in South Australia, Australia Felix, and the New Zealand Company's Settlements, with what has happened when colonies were founded without an emigration-fund. Although in the cases mentioned, the price of land was by no means sufficient, the amount of immigration in proportion to appropriated land was, to speak much within compass, twenty times greater than in any case where spontaneous emigration was alone relied upon for peopling the colony. I should not wonder to see it fifty times greater under the whole plan, not thwarted, but sustained by authority.

4. But whatever might be the amount of emigration caused by using the purchase-money of land as a fund for taking poor people to the colony, it would cause a different proportion between land and people from that which would take place if the purchase-money were any otherwise employed: the proportion of population to appropriated land would be very much greater in the one case than in the other. From this it follows, that the price of waste land, which would be only sufficient if the purchase-money were not used for emigration, would be excessive if it were so used. Suppose that without an emigration fund, £5 per acre proved the sufficient price; that is, neither too much nor too little. But that means neither too much nor too little for a certain proportion of people to land, emigration not being promoted by a public fund. Now apply the emigration-fund. So many more people go to the colony, that the proportion of people to land is greatly increased. The price of £5 was just sufficient for the old proportion: it is excessive under the new proportion. If under the old proportion it just prevented labourers from becoming landowners too soon, under the new one it would prevent them from doing so soon enough.

By causing an excessive proportion of people to land, it would bring down wages, do a wrong to the labouring emigrants, and render the colony unpopular with that class at home. Then would be seen a necessity for altering the price; for lowering it from what just sufficed without an emigration-fund, to what would just suffice with one. The general conclusion is, that a less price would be sufficient if the purchase-money were, than if it were not devoted to emigration.

With an emigration-fund, therefore, the new land would be cheaper; and the cheaper waste land is in a colony, provided it is dear enough to prevent a mischievous scarcity of labour, the more are people of all classes at home induced to select that colony for their future home. The emigration-fund, besides enabling poor people to go to the colony, and attracting capitalists by enabling them to take labourers along with them, would provide for all classes the attraction of cheaper land than if there were no emigration-fund. Altogether, the effect of devoting the purchase-money of land to emigration, would be to accelerate immensely the rate of colonization, and to augment more quickly than by any other disposition of the fund, the population, wealth, and greatness of the empire,

(5) A particular effect of devoting the purchase-money to emigration remains to be noticed; and a very pleasing effect it would be. The term of the labourer's service for hire would be shorter; the time when he might turn into a landowner with advantage to the whole colony, would come sooner. Suppose £5 were the sufficient price without an emigration-fund, and £2 with one. With new land at £5 an acre, the emigrant labourers might, always on the average, have to work ten years for wages before they could buy enough land to set up upon as masters: with new land at £2 an acre they could become landowners and masters at the end of four years. These figures are entirely hypothetical; and what the real difference would prove to be I do not pretend to say; but manifestly it would be very considerable. It is a difference which should be strongly impressed on the mind of the colonizing legislator; for a perception of it teaches that the devotion of the purchase-money to emigration, besides being the disposition of the land-fund most conducive to the increase of population and imperial wealth and greatness, would powerfully tend to render the whole system popular with the working classes, and, in particular, to prevent them from objecting to the groundwork of the system, which is the sufficient price.

LETTER LVI. FROM THE STATESMAN

Mr. Mothercountry objects to the sufficient price, that it would put a stop to the sale of waste land.

I have a pleasure in being able to inform you, that your plan of land-selling and emigration is now as clear to me, as it was lately involved in a sort of mysterious obscurity. Now, at least, I understand it. I see too, that my Mr. Mothercountry, upon whom I can make no impression by repeating your exposition of the plan, has never understood it. And no wonder; for it is plain that he has never tried to understand it, and is still unwilling to be taught. On this subject, he is a striking example of the proverb about wilful deafness.

However, amongst the foolish objections which he makes to the plan, and which I was able to dispose of myself, there is one which I was incapable of meeting. You shall have it in his own words, so far at least as I am now able to avoid falling into your manner of writing on this subject. He said: "Admitting, as I am far from doing, that the plan would work in a colony founded according to it, it is wholly inapplicable to the present colonies; and after the turmoil occasioned by these amateur colonizers in the South Australian and New-Zealand affairs, we are not likely to let them get up any more colonies. In a colony already established, the plan could not work, because the only effect of the 'sufficient price' would be to put a complete stop to the sale of waste land. It would have this effect, because in all these colonies, for years and years to come, land already appropriated will be extremely cheap. My own opinion is (and I hold the faith in common with Adam Smith, and all other economists who wrote before this new light broke upon the world), that land in a colony ought to be extremely cheap; the cheaper the better: but be that as it may, to sell dear land in a colony where there is plenty of cheap land, would be simply impossible. An effect of the old plan of colonizing (which I think a good effect produced by a good plan) is to make it impossible, that the new plan should have any effect but that of completely preventing further colonization. In most of the colonies, not an acre would be sold for ages at this nonsensical sufficient price. This scheme of a sufficient price, take it at the best, is an impracticable theory. Allow me to say, that I am surprised to see a person of your understanding waste his time on such a whimsey."

LETTER LVII. FROM THE COLONIST

The colonist examines Mr. Mothercountry's proposition, that the sufficient price would put a stop to sales of land.—Suggestion of loans for emigration to be raised on the security of future sales.

Your Mr. Mothercountry's objection would show, that he understands the sufficient price better than you have been led to suppose. I could explain the state of his mind on the subject; but it is not worth while. On one point I quite agree with him. The Colonial Office will easily prevent the foundation of any more colonies. Amongst those who, of late years, have tormented the Colonial Office by founding colonies, there is not one that could be persuaded to take part in another enterprise of the kind; so effectually has the Colonial Office, by tormenting them in its turn, disgusted them with such work. As most of them are public men of more or less mark, or topping London merchants, their dread of having anything to do with the Colonial Office has so far become a general feeling, that I can only wonder at the recent formation of a society for planting a fresh settlement in New Zealand. The time, however, is not distant when these latest amateurs of colonization will be as sick of the pursuit as the others have long been. But this is becoming a digression.

In his objection to the sufficient price, your Mr. Mothercountry is both right and wrong in supposing, that no public land at all would be sold in the case which he puts. No public land would be sold to people of the labouring class; none to anybody whose object was to get land as cheap as possible. But however high the price of public land, and however great the excess of appropriated land, there would be spots in the unappropriated territory enjoying, or likely to enjoy, peculiar advantages of position, which speculators would buy with a view to selling their land again. I allude to such spots as the mouths of rivers, the shores of harbours, and other good natural sites of towns, which it might "pay" to buy, even though the district surrounding them were only used for pasturage or lumbering, and remained for some time unappropriated. By degrees, a certain town population growing in these spots, the land in their immediate vicinity would acquire a position-value above the sufficient price, and would be sold accordingly. In a like manner, if a good road were made through the wilderness, between a harbour and one of these spots in the interior, much of **the** land on both

sides of the road would acquire a position-value above the sufficient price, and would then be sold. Again, in various spots throughout an unappropriated pastoral district, sheep and cattle farmers would be glad to buy, at almost any price, enough ground for a homestead and some cultivation around it. I perceive many other cases in which public land would be sold, notwithstanding that its price was higher than the price of the cheapest appropriated land; but these examples suffice for exhibiting the principle of such sales. The principle is, that position-value would not be affected by the sufficient price, but would be just the same, wherever it occurred, whether the sufficient price were high or low. This value would generally exceed the highest conceivable sufficient price; and whenever it did, the land would be bought at the sufficient price, whatever that might be. I am inclined to think, that although the sufficient price was high enough to prevent the sale of any land not enjoying a value of position, position-value would continually spread into and along the nearest boundaries of unappropriated districts; and that thus considerable sales of public land would take place, and a considerable emigration-fund would be obtained, notwithstanding the great cheapness of the cheapest appropriated land. In some colonies, such as New Zealand, where the quantity of appropriated land is not yet monstrously excessive, an emigration-fund would soon accrue; and the outlay of the emigration-fund, by pouring people into the colony, would soon raise the value of the cheapest private land to an equality with the price of public land. So far, then, I think Mr. Mothercountry in the wrong.

On the other hand, I fully agree with him, that where private land is monstrously superabundant, the sufficient price would, for a long while, stop the sale of all public land not possessing or acquiring a position-value. But, as he ought to have told you, I have always been aware of this difficulty, and have suggested various means of overcoming it.

The first suggestion is, that future sales should be anticipated, by the raising of loans on the security of such sales; and that the money should be laid out on emigration. This would be useful in the case of a new settlement, because the first emigrants might be loath to pay the sufficient price until the spot was in some measure peopled: it is indispensable, with the view of bestowing the advantages of the whole plan on a colony, where the old practice of granting land with profusion has made the cheapest land extremely cheap. In the case of a new

settlement, if the government peopled its land first, and sold it afterwards, it would sell it more readily than if it sold it first and peopled it afterwards. In the case of an old colony, where private land was extremely superabundant, the anticipation of future sales of public land, by raising money for emigration on that security, would alter the proportion of people to land in the appropriated territory, according to the scale on which this mode of proceeding was adopted. If enough people were thus conveyed to the appropriated territory to raise the price of the cheapest land there up to the price of public land, this part of the colony would be as well supplied with labour for hire, as it would have been originally if it had been founded on the plan of a sufficient price employed as an emigration-fund. But then, objectors have said, future sales of public land being anticipated, when these sales took place, the purchase-money, instead of being devoted to emigration, must be employed in paying off the loans; and for this part of the colony there would be no emigration-fund. Truly; but, in that case either an emigration-fund would not then be needed, or there would be a perfect equivalent for one as respects the goodness at least of the colonization. At a certain stage in the course of colonizing a waste country, and long before all the waste land is disposed of, it becomes most inexpedient to introduce more people from the mother-country; quite necessary to keep the remaining **waste** for the purposes of the colonial population, now very numerous and always rapidly increasing by births and spontaneous emigration. From that time forth, of course, the purchase-money of public land would first go to pay off the previous loans for emigration, and then form part of the general colonial revenue. But if this stage were not yet reached—if an emigration-fund were needed, but could not be got—then it would be necessary, from that time forth, to go on settling the wilderness without an emigration-fund, and to raise the price of public land up to what would be sufficient, the purchase-money *not* being devoted to emigration. In either case, the principle of the sufficient price would be maintained; scarcity of labour would be prevented.

This result, however, would not be obtained in the earlier stage of colonization, unless the scale of borrowing for emigration, on the security of future sales, were sufficient to supply in the appropriated territory whatever might be the demand for labour. On private land, the sufficient price would not be imposed by law. Therefore, until emigration raised the price

of the cheapest private land up to that of public land, emigrant labourers would be able to obtain land for less than the sufficient price: and in this case there might be a scarcity of labour, but not if emigration were on a great enough scale to put a labourer in the place of him who had become a landowner too soon. With emigration, indeed, proceeding and promised as to the future on this scale, few would be the owners of land who would be induced to part with an acre of their property for less than the price of public land. The future sales of public land being sufficiently anticipated, the future value of private land would be, as it were, sufficiently anticipated likewise by the unwillingness of the owners to sell for less than a price which at no distant day they would feel sure of obtaining. If so (but all, I repeat, would depend on the scale of emigration, actual and provided for), there would never be a vacuum in the labour-market for emigration to fill up: the evil would be prevented by the certainty of a remedy being at hand in case of need.

LETTER LVIII. FROM THE COLONIST

Suggestion of a further means for enabling the sufficient price of public land to work well in colonies where private land is greatly superabundant and very cheap.

But now let us suppose the case (which is that put by Mr. Mothercountry) of a colony in which land was greatly superabundant, but nothing at all was done to remedy the past profusion of the government in granting land. In this case, the putting of a price on new land would do good to nobody. The price, whatever its amount, would not be "sufficient" for the only legitimate end of putting any price on mere waste. In this case, then, the putting of a pretended sufficient price on new land is a useless impediment to the further appropriation of land in peculiarly eligible spots as these are discovered, a foolish check to colonizing enterprise, and a mischievous deduction from the capital of the pioneers of settlement. But this, which has been here supposed, is exactly what we do in New South Wales and some other colonies. In these actual cases, the price of public land, as an alleged means of doing some good, is a pretence or a delusion: the design of it is a pretence; the result of it is a delusion; the reality is nothing but a taxing of colonization for revenue. Do me the favour to ask Mr. Mothercountry if he knows of a worse species of taxation for colonies.

But it is easy to conceive another case, in which the government should be really desirous of giving full effect to the whole plan, but want means to pour into the colony enough people to raise the price of the cheapest private land up to the price of public land. The inability would consist of the want of a sufficient emigration-fund. The future sales of public land would not be deemed by capitalists a security valuable enough to warrant the advance on loan of all the money required. In this case, the cheapest private land being too cheap, labourers taken to the colony would too soon turn into landowners; and their place in the labour market would not be immediately filled by other emigrants. There might exist all the evils of scarcity of labour, notwithstanding a high price for public land, and some emigration by means of loans raised on the security of future sales.

If I have made the nature of the evil clear, you will readily perceive what kind of remedy would be appropriate. The object is to raise the price of the cheapest private, up to that of public, land. With this view, numerous modes of proceeding have been suggested. Amongst these is what they call in America, a "wild-land tax." This is a tax upon private land because it remains waste; a species of fine imposed on the owner for being a dog in the manger; for neither using his land nor selling it to somebody who would use it. This tax makes effectual war upon the nuisance of unoccupied, in the midst of occupied, private land; but it tends to lower instead of raising the price of land, by forbidding landowners to wait before they sell for an expected time of higher prices. This tax, therefore, is most inapplicable to the object now in view.

Another tax proposed with a view to that object, is one intended to have the effect of preventing owners of private land from selling at less than the price of public land. This would be a tax upon private sales below the public price, sufficient in amount, in each case respectively, to raise the buying price up to the public price. If, for example, the public price were £2 an acre, and the land were sold at £1, the buyer would have to pay £1 more to the government, paying in all £2; that is, the public price. In two different ways, this tax would conduce to the end contemplated. First, it would prevent emigrant labourers from getting land too soon; secondly, it would provide an additional security on which to raise loans for emigration. In theory, this tax is unobjectionable: the effect of it would be to apply to private land *after* mischievously

excessive appropriation, the whole principle of a sufficient price and loans for emigration as applied to waste land *before* appropriation. But I fear that this tax would not work in practice: it would, I think, be too easily evaded; for though government can prevent people from putting a value on something, less than the real one, by taking the thing off their hands at their own false valuation (as is done with respect to imported goods liable to *ad valorem* duty on importation), still I do not see how in the supposed case the buyer and the seller could be hindered from conspiring to pretend, that the price at which they dealt was equal to the price of public land though really far below it: and whenever they succeeded in making this pretence pass as a reality, they would evade the tax. The facility of evasion would be great; the temptation strong; not to mention the roguery which the practice of evasion would involve and render customary.

We are driven, therefore, to a kind of taxation which would neither be liable to evasion, nor so perfectly fitted to the object in view. This is a tax on all sales of private land acquired before the institution of the sufficient price for public land; and the devotion of the proceeds of the tax to emigration, either directly in defraying the cost of passage for labouring people, or indirectly as an additional security on which to raise emigration-loans. The tax might be either *ad valorem*; so much per cent., that is, upon the purchase-money of every sale: or it might be, what would much better agree with the object of the tax, a uniform sum per acre equal to the acreable price of public land. Thus if the price of public land were £2, the purchaser of 100 acres of private land, at whatever price, would have to pay £200 to the government as a contribution to the emigration-fund. It would be requisite to make the purchaser liable, because the seller, having got his money, might evade the tax; whereas the purchaser could be made to pay the tax or forfeit the land. Or rather, probably, the best mode of levying the tax would be a good system of registration, under which payment of the tax would be a condition of valid title. Whatever the mode, however, of preventing evasion of the tax, when due, the imposition of this tax on the first sale of any land after the law came into force (but of course not on any subsequent sale of that land) would be to put the sufficient price upon all the land of the colony, with this only difference between public and private land, that in one case the price would be paid before, and in the other, sooner or later, after appropriation.

I see one way, and only one, in which this tax could be evaded. Labourers wishing to get land, but unable or unwilling to pay the tax in addition to the purchase-money, might induce proprietors to let land to them on so long a lease as to make the tenure equal in value to freehold, or at all events on such a tenure as would serve the labourer's purpose. It would therefore be requisite to impose the tax upon lettings as well as sales. When, after a day fixed by the law, land was let, the lessee, or landlord, or rather the land, would become liable for the tax. A provision in the registration for invalidating lettings in respect of which the tax was not paid, would prevent evasion of this part of the measure.

I have called this measure a tax on sales and lettings, but have done so only for the sake of facility of exposition. It would not really be a tax, because one effect of the whole plan of colonization, an essential part of which this measure is, would be, supposing the payments on sales and lettings of private land to be an additional security for emigration-loans, to increase the value of all private land by at least as much as the amount of the tax. Indeed, ere long, the rapid pouring of people into the colony which would be possible with the double security for emigration-loans, must render the tax a mere trifle in comparison with the new value which it would help to confer immediately on private land. But, there is one case of hardship which might happen in the meanwhile, and which should be guarded against. The whole system being in operation, most owners would not be sellers or letters, but tenacious holders of their landed property; waiters for the great and general rise in the value of land, which they would see to be approaching. But some few would be unable to wait: their circumstances would command, and yet the tax might forbid them to sell or let. In order comprehensively and effectually to guard against such cases of hardship, the government might give notice before the whole law of colonization came into force, that it would purchase at a valuation any land which anybody wished to sell in that way. A time must of course be fixed, after which the government would no longer do this. As the valuation in every case would be according to the very low value of the land at the time, excluding all allowance for prospective value, no landowners, I repeat, except those who at that particular time were under a necessity of selling, would offer their land to the government. These, I am persuaded, would be very few. Whatever land came into the hands of

government under this part of the law, would be resold as soon as a price was offered for it equal to a sum composed of the price which the government had paid, of all the expenses incurred, and of the tax on sales. Such a price would be offered before long. If it were deemed unadvisable or impossible that the government should be out of its money so long, then the law might provide that the government, instead of paying for the land at the time of buying it, should engage to pay interest on the price till the land should be sold again, and then to pay the principal. This engagement of the government would be as valuable to the seller, if it were made transferable like an Exchequer Bill, as the purchase-money in hand.

I am much afraid that you must be growing tired of these doctrinal particulars.

LETTER LIX. FROM THE STATESMAN

The statesman tells of Mr. Mothercountry's intention to make the Commissioners of Colonial Land and Emigration write objections to the sufficient price for waste land.

As decidedly as common prudence will allow me to express an opinion on a question so new to me, I think you have shown that the extreme cheapness of private land in some colonies is not, even as respects those colonies only, a valid objection to the sufficient price for public land. But Mr. Mothercountry still objects to it. He does not offer specific objections to your plan for remedying the evils of superabundant private land, but merely says that it is absurd. When I pressed for his reasons, he proposed to write to me on the subject; and I have accepted his offer. I gathered that his intention is to set the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners the task of objecting to the latter part of your scheme; and as they ought to be masters of a subject which it is their especial function to understand thoroughly, I wish to keep my own opinions on it unsettled till after seeing what they may have to say. If I get anything from them that appears worth sending to you, you shall have it without delay.

Do not suppose that I am tired of your "doctrinal particulars." On the contrary, I feel obliged to you for taking the trouble to furnish me with them; for I wish to understand the subject thoroughly, not to get a superficial smattering of it. I imagine, however, that we are near the end.

THE ART OF COLONIZATION

LETTER LX. FROM THE COLONIST

The colonist anticipates the probable writing of the Commissioners.

Theoretically, indeed, it is the especial function of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners to be masters of the subject which their title expresses; but practically they have very different functions. Of these, one which the Colonial Office frequently imposes on them, is that of picking holes in a suggestion about colonization, which the Office dislikes *per se*, or dislikes being troubled with. By much practice they have become skilful in this sort of official business, and really do it very well. You may expect, therefore, some cleverish special-pleading against "saddling colonies with debt," "taxing the feeble resources of young societies," and "giving an unhealthy stimulus to emigration." As these gentlemen always have an eye to their chief's predilections and antipathies, they may also throw in an argument for "spontaneous" emigration, of which Lord Grey has been very fond ever since certain elaborate and impracticable schemes of his own for promoting what he now calls "forced" emigration, all broke down. But they will not, partly because they dare not, examine the question candidly with a view of throwing light upon it. They dare not, because, in the first place, though their office is in Park-street, they are, from the very nature of the commission, mere clerks of colonial Downing-street; and secondly, because, whilst the "good hater," whose helpless subordinates these Commissioners are at present, hates nothing more than a suggestion of mine, his irascible and vindictive temper makes those who are at his mercy, and who know him, tremble at the thought of his displeasure.

I hope indeed that we are not far from the end; but several matters remain to be explained, because they are really essential conditions of the well-working of the plan of colonization as here laid down. Nay, as such, they are rather parts of the plan.

LETTER LXI. FROM THE COLONIST

The necessity of perfect liberty of appropriation at the sufficient price.—Liberty of appropriation dependent on ample and accurate surveys.—Actual surveying in the colonies.

At the sufficient price, there should be the most complete liberty of acquiring private property in public land: for any restriction of this liberty would be tantamount to a restriction

of the quantity of land open to purchase, and would be a difficulty, over and above the sufficient price, placed in the way of a labourer desirous to become a landowner. If the price were really sufficient, any further restriction would be an oppression of the labouring class. Though not so oppressive to the other classes, it would be very unjust and very impolitic as respects them also; since if the government professed to allow the utmost liberty of appropriation on the one condition of paying the sufficient price, any further restriction, not absolutely unavoidable, would be a wrong, and the completion of a fraud, towards every purchaser. If the further restriction were irregular and uncertain in its force, every man would be put out in his calculations; nobody would be able to regulate his proceedings by his knowledge of the law: the system, instead of being administered according to law, would be subject to arbitrary and perhaps mysterious derangement, like our present political government of the colonies.

A price which would be sufficient with perfect liberty of appropriation, must be both excessive and insufficient without that liberty. If the price by itself were restriction enough, then a restriction of the quantity besides would be like adding to the price for some purchasers and diminishing it for others. If the quantity were so restricted as to occasion competition, one with another among intending purchasers, there would be a scramble for the land; and though nobody would pay more than the fixed price, those who were not so fortunate as to get land from the government, would have to buy from the others at an enhanced price; or they would have to go without land: and in either case, the lucky or perhaps favoured purchasers from the government would really obtain land possessing at the time a competition-value over and above its cost, which would be the same thing for them as getting land for less than the price of public land. The price, therefore, at which people obtained public land, would virtually be, in some cases more, in some less, than the price required by the government as being neither more nor less than sufficient. This counteraction of the principle of the sufficient price would be a serious evil, but not the only one. In addition to it, in the case supposed of competition produced by a restriction of quantity, there would be a frequent selection of the same spot by many purchasers, and a drawing of lots for the preference; much merely speculative investment; plenty of waiting; and plenty of bad blood amongst neighbours. There would be, in short, though in a mitigated degree, **all the evils**

which attend upon restricting the quantity of land with a view to competition, and then selling by auction.

It seems at first sight, that nothing would be easier than to establish a perfect liberty of appropriation. The government, apparently, would only have to tell every purchaser to go and pick the land he liked best, as soon as the purchase-money was paid. But what is it that he would have to pick out of? A great wilderness, about which, until it was duly surveyed, nobody could possess the requisite knowledge for picking well. Suppose, however, though it must be merely for the sake of illustration, that purchasers generally could find out without a proper survey, where the best land was; where this or that natural circumstance existed that suited their respective objects; where the land was most heavily timbered, where clear of timber, where alluvial, where light; where water abounded, and was scarce; what was the course of streams; where mill-sites and fords occurred; the probable line of future roads; and so forth *ad infinitum*: suppose all this, if you can conceive what is manifestly impossible, and even then what would happen? The explorer, having chosen his spot, could not describe its boundaries to the government; in most cases, he could not even tell the government where the spot was; for without a map, he could not say it is here or there. Without a map, all he could say is, it is somewhere where I have been, but whereabouts the spot is I cannot tell, except that it is near a river, and not far from some hills.

On looking twice, therefore, at this subject, it becomes plain that in order to let the purchaser choose his land with a sufficient knowledge of the country, and further in order to let him point out his choice to the government and obtain a properly descriptive title, a good map, the result of a careful survey, is indispensable. Waste land not surveyed, is not land open to purchasers, any more than unpicked cotton or unthrashed corn is fit for market.

It follows, that if the sufficient price were intended to be the only restriction as to quantity, and that, as to choice within the quantity open to purchasers, there was to be no restriction, the whole plan could not work even decently without ample surveys. The surveys should, at least, be so extensive as to prevent anyone from being compelled to take inferior land when there was superior land within reach. Except in countries of immense extent, the surveys should extend over the whole colony: and at any rate, for all colonies, a very large extent of

the waste adjoining every settlement should at all times be kept surveyed, in order that so wide a liberty of choice should at all times exist.

I hardly know which is of the most consequence; extent, or completeness and accuracy of survey. Whatever the extent, the whole affair would be in a mess without completeness and accuracy. Without completeness—that is, unless all the natural features of the country, and all sorts of information about its varied soils and natural productions, were laid down on the map—purchasers would choose in ignorance, would often make bad selections, and would justly reproach the government with having misled them. Without accuracy, all kinds of confusion would arise in settling, or rather in pretending to settle, the boundaries of selections; and as the land increased in value (which under the operation of the whole system it would do almost as soon as it was bought), there would be boundless and endless litigation amongst purchasers, and between purchasers and the government.

The evils above described as being sure to arise from insufficiency, incompleteness, and inaccuracy of survey, though presented to you hypothetically, are wretched facts in all our colonies more or less; and in some of the colonies, the whole mischief is so great as to be hardly credible by those who have not witnessed it. For an ample description of it in one case, I would refer you to Lord Durham's Report, and the evidence, in one of its appendices (B), on which his picture of surveys in Canada was founded. If you should take the trouble to examine it, you will agree with me that the whole system, or rather slovenly practice, of public surveying in Canada was at that time really abominable. It is not much better now. In several other colonies, it is as bad as it ever was in Canada. In hardly any colony is it better than very mistaken in theory, defective in practice, and most extravagant in cost. In the United States alone, the government has seriously thought about this matter, and done what it conceived to be best and cheapest. But the plan of that government is unsuited to open countries, where artificial marks on the ground are soon obliterated; and it also has the effect of circumscribing freedom of choice within limits that would be too narrow if public land cost the sufficient price. In the one or two of our colonies where public surveying has been best managed, it is far behind that of the United States in efficiency and accuracy; and in no one British colony has a system been adopted, that would allow a sufficient price

to work half as well as if the surveys were sufficient in extent, complete, accurate, and cheap. How they might be made all this, is a question upon which I am ready to enter if you please; though I think you may as well spare yourself the trouble of examining it whilst our system of colonial government shall remain as it is, and those who administer it be jealously adverse to every proposal of improvement. If, however, you do not investigate this subject now, I must beg of you to take for granted, that a vast improvement of colonial surveying would not be difficult, and to remember that without it the plan of a sufficient price with its appendages cannot work well.

LETTER LXII. FROM THE COLONIST

Proposed selection of emigrants, with a view of making the emigration-fund as potent as possible.—Moral advantages of such a selection

When it was first proposed to sell waste land instead of granting it, and to use the purchase-money as an emigration-fund, the further proposal was made, that the money should be expended in paying for the passage of labouring people only, and that in the selection of such people for a passage wholly or partially cost free, a preference should always be given to young married couples, or to young people of the marriageable age in an equal proportion of the sexes. The latter suggestion was founded on certain considerations which I will now mention.

1. The emigration-fund ought to be laid out so as to take away from the old country, and introduce into the colonies, the greatest possible amount of population and labour; in such a manner that, as an emigration-fund, it should have the maximum of effect both on the colonies and the mother-country.

2.¹ If the object were to procure at the least cost the greatest amount of labour for immediate employment in the colonies, it would appear at first sight that the emigrants ought to be, all of them, in the prime of life. But it is only at first sight that this can appear; because on reflection it is seen, that two men having to perform, each for himself, all the offices that women of the labouring class usually perform for men—to cook their own victuals, to mend their own clothes, to make their

¹ The next few pages repeat, usually in identical language, the arguments already used in *England and America* (above, pp. 173-8).

own beds, to play the woman's part at home as well as the man's part in the field or workshop—to divide their labour between household cares and the work of production—would produce less than one man giving the whole of his time to the work of production. This is a case which illustrates the advantages of combination of labour for division of employments. If the two men combined their labour, and so divided their employments—one occupying himself solely with household cares for both, and the other with earning wages for both—then might the produce of their united labour be equal to that of one married man; but, speaking generally, it would not be more. In new colonies, men have often made this unnatural arrangement; and to some extent they do so now *in* colonies where there are many more men than women. We need not stop to look at the moral evils of an excess of males. In an economical view only, it seems plain that poor emigrants taken 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.

3. 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 it would be weak, and because after middle age few workmen can readily turn their hands to employments different from those to which they are accustomed. In order that poor emigrants taken 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 could readily turn their hands to new employments.

4. But are there any objections to a mixture of children? To this there are four principal objections, besides others. First, if the children were the offspring of grown-up emigrants, it follows that those parents could not be of the best age; that if old enough to have children, they would be too old to come under the description of the most valuable labourers. Secondly, children are less fit than old people to undergo the confinement and other troubles of a long sea voyage. Of this you may convince yourself by visiting a ship full of emigrants at Gravesend, bound to New York. You will find those who are parents, and especially the mothers, 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 things! who have plenty to eat for the first time in their lives; if paupers, looking back without affection, and to the future with gladsome hope,

but, being parents, with apprehension lest, in the distant land of promise, the children should suffer more than they have endured at home. You will see the children, if of the pauper class, delighted at meal-times, smiling with greasy lips, their eyes sparkling over the butcher's meat, but at other times sick of the confinement, tired of having nothing to do, wanting a play-place, always in the way, driven from pillar to post, and exposed to serious accidents. Those poor emigrants, on the contrary, who are neither parents nor children—young men and women without any incumbrance—you will find quite at their ease, enjoying the luxury of idleness, pleased with the novelty of their situation, in a state of pleasurable excitement, glorying in the prospect of independence, thanking God that they are still without children, and, if you should know how to make them speak out, delighted to talk about the new country, in which, as they have heard, children are not a burthen but a blessing. Thirdly, when children first reach a colony, they necessarily encumber somebody. They cannot for some time be of any use as labourers: they cannot produce wealth wherewith to attract, convey, and employ other labourers. To whatever extent, then, the emigration-fund should be laid out in removing children instead of grown-up people, the value received by mother-country and colony would be less than might be. By taking none but very young grown-up persons, the maximum of value would be obtained for any given outlay.

5. 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 all seek a new home. The natural time of marriage, too, is one when the mind is most disposed to hope, to ambition, to engaging in undertakings which require decision and energy of purpose. Marriage, besides, 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, until lately rougher and longer than the sea-way from England to America? Neither of single men, nor of old people, nor of middle-aged people dragging children along with them, but, for the most part, of young couples, seeking a new home, fondly encouraging each other, strong in health and spirits, not driven from birth place by the fear of want, but attracted to a new place by motives of ambition for themselves

and for children to come. This then is the class of people, that could be most easily attracted to a colony by high wages and better prospects. The class which it is most expedient to select, would be the most easily persuaded to avail themselves of a preference in their favour.

6. A preference in favour of the best class is all that the law should declare. For there might not exist in the old country a sufficient number of the most valuable class of labouring emigrants to supply the colonial demand for labour. Suppose, for example, that the United States determined to lay out the annual proceeds of their waste-land fund, which on the average exceeds £1,000,000, in providing a passage for poor young couples from Ireland to America. This outlay, the passage of each person costing £4, would provide for the annual emigration of 125,000 couples. But in Ireland there are not so many as 125,000 couples, or 250,000 individuals, born in the same year and grown up. As the constant emigration of all, or may be half, the couples who every year reach the age of marriage, must very soon depopulate any country, we may be sure that a portion only of this class will 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 necessary to offer a passage to couples older or younger by one, two or three years, but always giving a preference to those who were nearest to the marriageable age. At all times, in short, the administrators of the emigration-fund could only give a preference to the most eligible applicants at the time.

7. Supposing all the people taken to a 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 the number of emigrants had been nearly 20,000. This rapid decrease of population was owing in some measure to the miserable state of things that existed in Virginia before the colony was enriched by the introduction of slave-labour; but it was in no small degree owing to this; that of the 20,000 emigrants, only a very few were females. As there was hardly any increase of people by births in the colony, the local population would at all events have been less at the end of twenty years, than the number of emigrants during that period. In New South Wales, it has never been difficult for the poorest class to maintain a family: yet until

THE ART OF COLONIZATION

young couples were for the first time taken to that colony about sixteen years ago, its population was nothing like as great as the number of emigrants. Of those emigrants (they were mostly convicts), by far the greater number were men; and of the handful of women, many were past the age of child-bearing. Had they consisted of men and women in equal proportions, but of the middle age, the number of emigrants might still have exceeded the colonial population; but if they had consisted of young couples just arrived at the age of marriage, the population of the colony would have advanced with surprising rapidity. I once reckoned that at the time in question, the population of the colony would have been 500,000 instead of its actual amount, 50,000; that the increase of people, and, we may add, the rate of colonization, would have been ten times greater than they were, with the same outlay in emigration. At that time, the proportion of young people in New South Wales was very small: in the supposed case, it would have been much greater than it has ever been in any human society. According, of course, to this large proportion of young people would have been the prospect of future increase. If all the people who have removed from Europe and Africa to America, had been young couples just arrived at the marriageable age, slavery in North America must have long since died a natural death: no part of North America, perhaps no part of South America, would now be open to colonization.

8. In any colony, the immediate effect of selecting young couples for emigration, would be to diminish in a curious degree the cost of adding to the colonial population. The passage of young couples would not cost more than that of all classes mixed; but the young couples would take to the colony the greatest possible germ of future increase. In fact, the settlers of New South Wales who in a few years made that colony swarm with sheep, did not import lambs or old sheep; still less did they import a large proportion of rams. They imported altogether a very small number of sheep, compared with the vast number they soon possessed. Their object was the production in the colony of the greatest number of sheep by the importation of the smallest number, or, in other words, at the least cost; and this object they accomplished by selecting for importation those animals only, which, on account of their sex and age, were fit to produce the greatest number of young in the shortest time. If emigrants were selected on the same principle, the appropriated land, it is evident, would become

as valuable as it could ever be, much sooner than if the emigrants were a mixture of people of all ages. In the former case, not only would all the emigrants be of the most valuable class as labourers, but they would be of the class fit to produce the most rapid increase of people in the colony, and so to confer on new land as soon as possible the value that depends on position. The buyer of new land, therefore, would have his purchase-money laid out for him in the way most conducive to a demand for accommodation-land and building-ground; in the way that would serve him most. And something *else* would flow from this selection of emigrants, which it is very needful to observe. The emigration-fund being so much more potent in its operation, any given outlay would have a greater effect on the colonial proportion of land to people. With the selection, the labour-market would be more largely supplied than without it: a shorter term of labour for hire by the emigrants would suffice for the greatest productiveness of industry: a lower price of public land would be sufficient. And yet both of the proposed securities on which to borrow money for emigration, would be more valuable: notwithstanding the lower price for public land and the lower tax on private sales and lettings, the means of paying off the emigration-loans would be obtained much sooner than without this selection of emigrants. With the selection, it would be more easy, as well as in many ways more advantageous, to get the whole plan into full work, even in colonies where land is the most superabundant.

9. The moral advantages of such a selection of emigrants would not be few. If the emigrants were married (as they all ought to be, and as by rejecting unmarried applicants, it would be easy to take care that they should be), each female would have a special protector from the moment of her departure from home. No man would have an excuse for dissolute habits. All the evils which in colonization have so often sprung from a disproportion between the sexes, and which are still very serious in several colonies, would be completely averted. Every pair of emigrants would have the strongest motives for industry, steadiness, and thrift. In a colony thus peopled, there would be hardly 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 ever took place since Shem, Ham and Japhet were surrounded by their little ones. The colony would be an immense nursery, and, all being at ease,

would present a finer opportunity than has ever occurred for trying what may be done for society by really educating the common people.

The selection and conveyance of poor emigrants obtaining a passage to the colonies by means of the purchase-money of waste land, is the part of the plan of the theorists of 1830, which in practice has been attended with the least disappointment. The example of something like a careful administration of this part of the theory was set by the South Australian Commissioners, who were zealously assisted by two of the framers of the theory in starting this new kind of emigration. By following the example thus set, the New-Zealand Company and the Colonial Office Commissioners in Park-street have brought about a revolution in the character, at least, of long-sea emigration for the poorer classes. A voyage of 16,000 miles is now made by a shipful of poor emigrants, with a lower rate of mortality amongst them during the voyage, than the average rate of mortality in the class formed by the families of our peerage. In most of the ships, the number of passengers is greater at the end than at the beginning of the voyage. The Southern colonies have received by this means, a class of labouring emigrants incomparably superior in point of usefulness to the old-fashioned ship-loads of shovelled-out paupers. The nearer equality of the sexes in this emigration has produced the good moral results that were expected from it, or rather averted the very bad moral results that had flowed from inequality between the sexes in all previous emigration: and the colonies to which this selected emigration has been directed, have received an amount of the germ of increased population, of which, in proportion to the number of emigrants, there has been no previous example. Altogether, what has been done, establishes the infinite superiority of systematic emigration to that "spontaneous" scramble which Lord Grey now applauds, and which, often afflicting Canada with malignant fever, necessitates a lazaretto on the St. Lawrence, as if, says Lord Durham, British emigrants came from the home of the plague.

But the administration of the emigration-fund of colonies is still, I believe, open to great improvements. The selection of emigrants has never been as good as it might be. The South-Australian Commissioners were new to their work, and neither personally interested in it nor responsible to anybody. The New-Zealand Company was for years rather a company for disturbing the Colonial Office and usefully agitating colonial

questions of principle, than for colonizing; and now it is only a company for trying in vain to colonize. The Commissioners in Park-street have not been of a class, to whom much personal intercourse with poor emigrants could be agreeable (and without close personal intercourse between the poorest emigrants and the highest executive authority in this matter, it is impossible that the business should be very well done); they have been in no measure responsible to the colonies whose funds they expended, and which were alone much interested in watching their proceedings; their official house, in Westminster, seems poked as if on purpose out of the way of shipping business and emigrant resort; and they have naturally fallen into a practice, which must be extremely convenient to them, of getting their emigration business done by contract and by men of business. But the main business of the contractors is to make as much as they can by their contracts. So we hear of emigrant ships bound to Adelaide or Port Philip, receiving a few English passengers in London, and filling up with the most wretched Irish at Plymouth, whom the contractor finds it "pay" to bring from Cork on purpose to fill up with, because, as respects food and accommodation during the voyage, there are no passengers that cost so little as the Irish poor, or are so easily imposed upon by the captain who represents the contractor. This case of defrauding the colonies by sending them inferior labour for their money which pays for superior, indicates that it does not stand alone as to mismanagement. In all parts of this administration, all the administrators have mismanaged a little. There has been a little waste of precious funds, a little neglect here and there, a little overlooked deviation from rules, a little imposition of "false character" upon the examiners of applications for a passage, and, I rather think, not a little jobbing in accommodating friends or persons of influence with a free passage to the colonies for emigrants whom they wanted to shovel out. The sum of mismanagement is considerable. It would have been greater but for a sort of rivalry between companies and commissioners, which led them to watch each other, but which has now ceased; and it can only be surely guarded against in future, by a plain, unmistakable, immutable law of emigration, with provisions for rendering its administrators in some measure responsible to the colonies, which alone can be sufficiently interested in the good administration of the law to furnish the safeguard of a vigilant public opinion constantly attending to particulars.

INDEX

(References to the Australian colonies are indexed under the modern name of each ; thus " Van Diemen's Land" is indexed under Tasmania ; Cockburn Sound, Swan River, etc., under Western Australia; Spencer Gulf, Port Lincoln, etc , under South Australia; 'Australia Felix" under Victoria.)

- AUSTRALIA, central position of, Hume, Joseph, 24
Hunter River, 10, 142
- Australian Agricultural Company, 18-19, 125, 129, 133
- Barrow, Sir John, quoted, 94, 97-8
- Bentham, Jeremy, quoted, 112, 120, 191
- Blaxiand, John, quoted, 129
- Bushranging, 49
- Canada, 68-9, 116, 118, 129-33, 137-8, 140, 155, 162-3, 168-9, 178-9, 193, 198-9, 208-9, 225, **246, 253**
- Cape Colony, The, 22, 26, 50, 118, 134-5
- Chinese, the, 14, 92-9, 116
- Clausel, General, quoted, 141
- Colonization, objects of, 113 sqq.
- Colonization Society, the, 157, 164, 166, 172, 177, 187
- Cunningham, F., quoted, 5, 36
- Curr, Edward, quoted, 6, 42n.
- "Currency Lassess," 29, 61-5
- Edinburgh Review*, cited, 75-6, 212, 216
- Emancipists, 12, 31
- Explorations, 57-9
- Finlayson, George, quoted, 96-7
- France, 6, 23, 26, 182-3
- Greek Colonies, 4, 70-3, 109-10, 197-8
- Grey, Lord, 221-2, 224, 243
- Horton, Wilmot, 82, 119, 178
- Humboldt, Baron von, quoted, 75
- Immigrants, selection of, 173-8, 184-5, 247-54
- Immigration, alien, 92 sqq. See Migration
- Italy, 5, 59, 62-4
- Las Casas, 19
- London Company, the, 130
- Macarthur, John, 41, 42, 162
- M'Culloch, Professor, 37, 120
- Malthus, T. R., 22, 84
- Martin's Act, 50
- Mexico, 69-70, 75
- Migration, methods of, 11-12, 14-15, 121-2, 123, 162; proposals for, 15-16, 77 sqq. See also Wakefield system
- Mill, James, quoted, 110-11, 112, 119, 122
- Murray, General, 54
- Naples, 5, 60, 67
- Naylor, Sir George, 37
- Negro slavery, 19-21, 50, 208, 229
- New South Wales: Climate, 5; convicts, 10-11, 33, 37-8, 50-1, 87, 127-8, 180; farming, 8-9, 13, 27, 59-60; government, 24-6, 31-3, 45, 65, 90, 140-2, 150, 192-5; land-grants and purchases, 6-7, 34, 87, 136, 140, 150-2, 154, 171, n., 205-7, 208-9; Press, 9; Society, 5, 21-2, 26-9, 35; soil, 5, 6, 59, 60, 128

- New Zealand, 209, 224, 232, 234-6, 253
- Parnell, Sir Henry, quoted, 117
- Parramatta, 12, 37
- Peel, Thomas, 130, 136, 143, 167
- Poland, 115
- Quarterly Review*, quoted, 3-4, 26-7, 163
- Raffles, Sir Stamford, quoted, 95-6
- Raynal, Abbe, quoted, 75, 139
- Ricardo, David, cited, 80-1
- Smith, Adam, quoted, 70-2, 112, 195, 196, 234
- South Australia, 131, 189, 195, 197, 199, 204, 209, 232, 253
- Staunton, Sir George, quoted, 93-4
- "Sufficient Price," explained, 203 sqq.
- Tasmania, 5, 17-19, 44-7, 57-8, 89, 118, 130, 140, 154n., 155, 17m., 207
- Tennant, C, quoted, 165-6
- United States, the, 18, 19, 25-6, 34-6, 46-7, 50-1, 66-9, 73-5, 78-80, 109-10, 117-18, 124, 130, 137-40, 148-9, 156-9, 168-70, 190, 196, 208, 218
- Victoria, 232, 249
- Wakefield system, described, x-xii, 100-6, 144 sqq. *See also* "Sufficient Price"
- Washington, George, quoted, 75
- Wentworth, W. C, quoted, 5, 136
- Western Australia, 58, 121, 125, 129-33, 143, 148. i54» 159, 162, 195, 196-7, 204
- Wool, 27-8, 39-42
- Volney, M., 60, 66-7

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY

A CLASSIFIED LIST OF THE 990 VOLUMES

In each of the thirteen classifications in this list (except BIOGRAPHY) the volumes are arranged alphabetically under the *authors' names*, but Anthologies and works by various hands are listed under titles. Where authors appear in more than one section, a cross-reference is given, viz.: (*See also* FICTION). The number at the end of each item is the number of the volume in the series.

BIOGRAPHY

- Audubon the Naturalist, Life and Adventures of. By R. Buchanan. 601
 Baxter (Richard), Autobiography of. Ed. by Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas. 808
 Beaconsfield (Lord), Life of. By J. A. Froude. 666
 Boiioz (Hector), Life of. Translated by Katherine F. Boulton. 602
 Blackwell (Dr. Elizabeth), Pioneer Work for Women. With an Introduction by Mrs. Fawcett. 607
 Blake (William), Life of. By Alexander Gilchrist. Edited by Ruthven Todd. Illustrated. 971. (*See also* POETRY AND DRAMA)
 Bronte (Charlotte), Life of. By Mrs. Gaskell. Intro. by May Sinclair. 318
 (*See also* FICTION)
 Browning (Robert), Life of. By E. Dowden. 701
 (*See also* POETRY AND DRAMA)
 Burney (Fanny), Diary. A selection covering all its years (1778-1840), edited by Lewis Gibbs. 960
 Burns (Robert), Life of. By J. G. Lockhart. Intro. by E. Rhys. 156
 (*See also* POETRY AND DRAMA)
 Buxton (Sir Thomas Fowell), Memoirs of. Ed. by Charles Buxton. 773
 Byron's Letters. Introduction by Andre Maurois. 931
 (*See also* POETRY AND DRAMA)
 Carey (William), Life of: Shoemaker and Missionary. By George Smith. 395
 Carlyle's Letters and Speeches of Cromwell 3 vols. 260-8
 Reminiscences. 875. (*See also* ESSAYS AND HISTORY)
 Cellini's (Benvenuto) Autobiography. 51
 Cibber's (Colley) An Apology for his Life. 668
 Columbus, Life of. By Sir Arthur Helps. 332
 Constable (John), Memoirs of. By C. F. Leslie, R.A. 563
 Cowper (William), Selected Letters of. Intro. by W. Hadley, M.A. 774
 (*See also* POETRY AND DRAMA)
 De Quincey's Reminiscences of the Lake Poets. Intro. by E. Rhys. 163
 (*See also* ESSAYS)
 De Retz (Cardinal), Memoirs. By Himself. 2 vols. 735-6
 Dickens (Charles), Life of. By John Forster. Introduction by G. K. Chesterton. 2 vols. 781-2. (*See also* FICTION)
 Disraeli (Benjamin), Life of. By J. A. Froude. 666
 Evelyn's Diary. 2 vols. Introduction by G. W. E. Russell. 220-1
 Fox (George), Journal of. Text revised by Norman Penney. 754
 Franklin's (Benjamin) Autobiography. 316
 Gibbon (Edward), Autobiography of. 511. (*See also* HISTORY)
 Gladstone, Life of. By G. W. E. Russell ('Onlooker'). 661
 Goethe, Life of. By G. H. Lewes. Intro. by Havelock Ellis. 269
 Hastings (Warren), Life of. By Capt. L. J. Trotter. 452
 Hodson of Hodson's Horse. By Capt. L. J. Trotter. 401 [956]
 Hudson (W. H.), Far Away and Long Ago. Autobiography of his youth.
 Hutchinson (Col.), Memoirs of. Intro. Monograph by F. P. G. Guizot. 317
 Johnson (Dr. Samuel), Life of. By James Boswell. 2 vols. 1-2
 Lives of the Poets. 770-1. (*See also* TRAVEL)
 Keats (John), Life and Letters of. By Lord Houghton. Introduction by R. Lynd. 801. (*See also* POETRY AND DRAMA)
 Lamb (Charles), Letters of. New edition, from the Complete Annotated Edition by E. V. Lucas. 2 vols. 342-3
 (*See also* ESSAYS and FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
 Lincoln (Abraham), Life of. By Henry Bryan Binns. 783. (*See also* ORATORY)
 Mahomet, Life of. By Washington Irving. Intro. Prof. E. V. Arnold. 513

issued November 1950. The Publishers regret that some of the volumes are out of print.
 A Selected List is available showing volumes mainly in stock.

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY - CLASSIFIED LIST

ESSAYS AND BELLES-LETTRES—continued

- Lawrence's (D. H.) Stories. Essays, and Poems. Ed. by Desmond Hawkins. 1958
- Lowell's (James Russell) Among My Books. 607
- Lynd's (Robert) Essays on Life and Literature. Intro, by Desmond MacCarthy. 990
- Macaulay's Essays. 2 vols. Introduction by A. J. Grieve, M.A. 225-6
- " Miscellaneous Essays and The Lays of Ancient Rome. 439
(See also HISTORY and ORATORY) [280]
- Machiavelli's The Prince. Special Trans. and Intro, by W. K. Marriott. 673
- Martinengro-Cesaresco (Countess): Essays in the Study of Folk-Song. 673
- Mazzini's Duties of Man, etc. Introduction by Thomas Jones, M.A. 224
- Milton's Areopagitica, etc. Introduction by Professor C. E. Vaughan. 795
(See also POETRY)
- Mitford's Our Village. Edited, with Intro., by Sir John Squire. 927
- Modern Humour. Edited by Guy Pocock and M. M. Bozman. 957
- Montagu's (Lady) Letters. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 69
- Montaigne's Essays. Florio's trans. Intro, by A. R. Waller. 3 vols. 440-2
- Newman's On the Scope and Nature of University Education, and a paper on Christianity and Scientific Investigation. Introduction by Wilfred Ward. 723. (See also PHILOSOPHY)
- Osborne's (Dorothy) Letters to Sir William Temple. Edited and con-notated by Judge Parry. 674
- Penn's The Peace of Europe. Some Fruits of Solitude, etc. 724
- Prelude to Poetry. The. Edited by Ernest Rhys. 789
- Quiller-Couch's (Sir Arthur) Cambridge Lectures, from The Art of Reading, The Art of Writing, Studies in Literature, and Shakespeare's Work-manship. 974. (See also FICTION)
- Reynold's Discourses. Introduction by L. March Phillipps. 118
- Rhys's New Book of Sense and Nonsense. 813
- Rousseau's Emile, or Education. Translated by Barbara Foxley. 518
(See also PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY)
- Ruskin's Crown of Wild Olive and Jests of Aglaia. 323
- " Elements of Drawing and Perspective. 217
- " Ethics of the Dust. Introduction by Grace Rhys. 282
- " Modern Painters. 5 vols. Introduction by Lionel Oust. 208-12
- " Pre-Raphaelitism. Lectures on Architecture and Painting. Academy Notes, 1855-9, and Notes on the Turner Gallery. Introduction by Laurence Bin von. 218
- " Sesame and Lilies, The Two Paths, and The King of the Golden River. Introduction by Sir Oliver Lodge. 219
- " Seven Lamps of Architecture. Intro, by Selwyn Image. 207
- " Stones of Venice. 3 vols. Intro, by L. March Phillipps. 213-15
- " Time and Tide with other Essays. 450
- " Unto This Last, The Political Economy of Art. 216
(See also FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
- Spectator, The. By Addison, Steele, and others. With Notes and full index. 4 vols. 164-7
- Spencer's (Herbert) Essays on Education. Intro, by C. W. Eliot. 504
- Sterne's Sentimental Journey and Journal and Letters to Eliza. Intro-duction by George Saintsbury. 796. (See also FICTION)
- Stevenson's In the South Seas and Island Nights' Entertainments. 769
- " Virginius Pucrisque and Familiar Studies of Men and Books. [765]
(See also FICTION, POETRY, and TRAVEL)
- Swift's Tale of a Tub, The Battle of the Books, etc. 347
(See also BIOGRAPHY and FICTION)
- Swinerton's (Frank) The Georgian Literary Scene. 943
- Table Talk. Edited by J. C. Thornton. 906
- Taylor's (Isaac) Words and Places, or Etymological Illustrations of History, Ethnology, and Geography. Intro, by Edward Thomas. 517
- Thackeray's (W. M.) The English Humorists and The Four Georges. Introduction by Walter Jerrold. 610. (See also FICTION)
- Thoreau's Walden. Introduction by Walter Raymond. 281
- Trench's On the Study of Words and English Past and Present. Intro-duction by George Sampson. 788
- Tytler's Essay on the Principles of Translation. 168
- Walton's Compleat Angler. Introduction by Andrew Lang. 70

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY CLASSIFIED LIST

FICTION

- Aimard's The Indian Scout. 428
Ainsworth's (Harrison) Old St. Paul's. Intro, by W. E. A. Axon. 522
" " The Admirable Crichton. Intro, by E. Rhys. 804
" " The Tower of London. 400
" " Windsor Castle. 709
" " Rookwood. Intro, by Frank Swinnerton. 870
American Short Stories of the 19th Century. Edited by John Cournos. 840
Austen's (Jane) Emma. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 24
" " Mansfield Park. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 23
" " Northanger Abbey and Persuasion. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 25
" " Pride and Prejudice. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 22
" " Sense and Sensibility. Intro, by R. B. Johnson. 21
Balzac's (Honore de) Atheist's Mass. Preface by George Saintsbury. 229
" " Catherine de Medici. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 419
" " Christ in Flanders. Intro, by George Saintsbury. 284
" " Cousin Pons. Intro, by George Saintsbury. 403
" " Eugenie Grandet. Intro, by George Saintsbury. 109
" " Lost Illusions. Intro, by George Saintsbury. 656
" " Old Goriot. Intro, by George Saintsbury. 170
" " The Cat and Racket, and Other Stories. 349
" " The Chouans. Intro, by George Saintsbury. 285
" " The Country Doctor. Intro, George Saintsbury. 530
" " The Country Parson. 686
" " The Quest of the Absolute. Intro, by George Saintsbury. 286
" " The Rise and Fall of Cesar Birotteau. 596
" " The Wild Ass's Skin. Intro, George Saintsbury. 26
" " Ursule Mirouet. Intro, by George Saintsbury. 733
Barbusse's Under Fire. Translated by Fitz walter Wray. 798
Bennett's (Arnold) The Old Wives' Tale. 919
Blackmore's (R.D.) Lorna Doone. 304
Borrow's Lavengro. Introduction by Thomas Seccombe. 119
" " Romany Rye. 120. (See also TRAVKT.)
Bronte's (Anne) The Tenant of Wildfell Hall and Agnes Grey. 685
" (Charlotte) Jane Eyre. Introduction by May Sinclair. 287
" " Shirley. Introduction by May Sinclair. 288
" " The Professor. Introduction by May Sinclair. 417
" " Villette. Introduction by May Sinclair. 351
" (Emily) Wuthering Heights. 243
Burney's (Fanny) Evelina. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 352
Butler's (Samuel; Erewhon and Kewehon' Revisited. Introduction by Desmond MacCarthy. 881
" " The Way of All Flesh. Intro, by A. J. Hoppe. 895
Collins's (Wilkie) The Woman in White. 464
" " The Moonstone. Intro, by Dorothy L. Sayers. 979
Conrad's Lord Jim. Introduction by R. B. Cunningham Grahame. 925
" " Nigger of the 'Narcissus,' Typhoon, and the Shadow Line. 980
Converse's (Florence) Long Will. 328
Dana's (Richard H.) Two Years before the Mast. 588
Daudet's Tartarin of Tarascon and Tartarin of the Alps. 423
Defoe's Fortunes and Misfortunes of Moll Flanders. Intro, by G. A. Aitken. 837
" " Captain Singleton. Introduction by Edward Garnett. 74
" " Journal of the Plague Year. Introduction by G. A. Aitken. 289
" " Memoirs of a Cavalier. Introduction by G. A. Aitken. 283
" " Robinson Crusoe. Complete text of Parts I and II. 59
CHARLES DICKENS'S WORKS. Each vol. with an Intro, by G. K. Chesterton.
American Notes. 290
Edwin Drood. 725
Barnaby Rudge. 76
Great Expectations. 234
Bleak House. 236
Hard Times. 292
Child's History of England. 291
Little Dorrit. 293
Christmas Books. 239
Martin Chuzzlewit. 241
Christmas Stories. 414
Nicholas Nickleby. 238
David Copperfield. 242
Old Curiosity Shop. 173
Domby and Son. 240
Oliver Twist. 233

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY • CLASSIFIED LIST

FICTION—*continued*

CHARLES DICKENS'S WORKS—*continued*

- Our Mutual Friend. 294
 Pickwick Papers. 235
 Reprinted Pieces. 744
 Disraeli's Coningsby. Introduction by Langdon Davies. 535
 Dostoevsky's (Fyodor) Crime and Punishment. Introduction by Laurence Irving. 501
 " " Letters from the Underworld and Other Tales. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 654
 " " Poor Folk and the Gambler. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 711
 " " Tho Possessed. Introduction by J. Middleton Murry. 2 vols. 861-2
 " " The House of the Dead, or Prison Life in Siberia. Introduction by Madame Stepniak. 533
 " " The Brothers Karamazov. Translated by Constance Garnett. 2 vols. 802-3
 " " The Idiot. 652
 Du Manner's (George) Trilby. Introduction by Sir (Jerald du Maurior. With the original illustrations. 863
 Dumas' Black Tulip. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 174
 " Chicot the Jester. 421
 " Le Chevalier de Maison Rouge. Tntro. by Julius Bramont. 614
 " Marguerite de Valois ('La Reine Margot'). 326
 " The Count of Monte Cristo. 2 vols. 393-4
 " The Forty-Five. 420
 " The Three Muskof eers. 81
 " The Vicomte de Urage lonne. 3 vols. 593-5
 " Twenty Years After. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 175
 Edgar's Cressy and Poictiers. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 17
 " Runnymede and Lincoln Fair. Intro. by L. K. Hughes. 320
 (See also FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
 Edgeworth's Castle Rackrent and The Absentee. 410
 Eliot's (George) Adam Bede. 27
 " Felix Holt. 353
 " Middlemarch. 2 vols. 854-5
 " Mill on the Floss. Intro. by Sir W. Robertson Nicholl. 325
 " Romola. Introduction by Rudolf Dircks. 231
 " Scenes of Clerical Life. 468
 " Silas Marner. Introduction by Annie Mathoson. 121
 English Short Stories. An Anthology. 743
 Erckmann-Chatrian's The Conscript and Waterloo. 354
 " " The Story of a Peasant. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 2 vols. 706-7
 Fenimore Cooper's The Deerelayer. 77
 " " The Last of the Mohicans. 79
 " " The Pathfinder. 78
 " " The Pioneers. 171
 " " The Prairie. 172
 Ferrier's (Susan) Marriage. Introduction by H. L. Morrow. 816
 Fielding's Amelia. Intro. by George Saintsbury. 2 vols. 852-3
 " Jonathan Wild and The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 877
 " Joseph Andrews. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 467
 " Tom Jones. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 2 vols. 355-6
 Flaubert's Madame Bovary. Translated by Eleanor Marx-Aveling. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 808
 " " Salammbd. Translated by J. S. Chartres. Introduction by Professor F. C. Green. 869
 " " Sentimental Education. Trans. by Anthony Goldsmith. 969
 Forster's (E.M.) A Passage to India. Introduction by Peter Burra. 972
 France's (Anatole) At the Sign of the Reine Pedauque and The Revolt of the Angels. Trans. by Mrs. Wilfred Jackson. Intro. by A. J. Hoppe. 967
 French Short Stories of the 19th and 20th Centuries. Selected, with an Introduction, by Professor F. C. Green. 896
 Galsworthy's (John) The Country House. 917
 Gait's Annals of a Parish. Introduction by Baillie Macdonald. 427

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY • CLASSIFIED LIST

FICTION—continued

- Gaskell's (Mrs.) *Cousin Phillis*, etc. Intro, by Thomas Seccombe. 615
 Cranford. 83
 " *Mary Barton*. Introduction by Thomas Seccombe. 598
 " *Sylvia's Lovers*. Intro, by Mrs. Ellis Chadwick. 524
Ghost Stories. Edited by John Hampden. 952
 (See also POETRY and DRAMA)
Gleig's (G. R.) *The Subaltern*. 708
Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*. Carlyle's Translation. 2 vols. 599-600
 (See also ESSAYS and POETRY)
Gogol's (Nicol) *Dead Souls*. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 726
 Taras Bulba and Other Tales. 740
Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield*. Introduction by J. M. D. 295
 (See also ESSAYS and POETRY)
Goncharov's *Oblomov*. Translated by Natalie Duddington. 878
Gorki's *Through Russia*. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 711
Grossmith's (George and Weedon) *Diary of a Nobody*. Illustrated.
 Introduction by Sir John Squire. 963
Harte's (Bret) *Luck of Roaring Camp and Other Tales*. 681
Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables*. Intro. Ernest Rhys. 176
 The Scarlet Letter. 122
 The Blithedale Romance. 592
 " *The Marble Faun*. Intro, by Sir Leslie Stephen. 424
 " *Twice Told Tales*. 531. (See also FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Hugo's (Victor) *Les Misérables*. Intro, by S. R. John. 2 vols. 363-4
 " *Notre Dame*. Introduction by A. C. Swinburne. 422
 " *Toilers of the Sea*. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 509
Italian Short Stories. Edited by D. Pettoello. 870
James's (G. P. R.) *Richelieu*. Introduction by Rudolf Dircks. 357
James's (Henry) *The Ambassadors*. Intro, by Frank Swinnerton. 987
 The Turn of the Screw and The Aspern Papers. 912
Jefferies' (Richard) *After London and Amoryllis at the Fair*. Intro, by
 David Garnett. 951. (See also FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Kinsley's (Charles) *Alton Locke*. 462
 " " *Hereward the Wake*. Intro, by Ernest Rhys. 296
 " " *Hypatia*. 230
 " " *Westward Ho!* Introduction by A. G. Grieve. 20
 Yeast. 611
 (See also POETRY and FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
 (Henry) Geoffrey Hamlyn. 416
 Ravenshoe. 28
Lawrence's (D. H.) *The White Peacock*. 914
Lever's *Harry Lorrequer*. Introduction by Lewis Melville. 177
Loti's (Pierre) *Iceland Fisherman*. Translated by W. P. Baines. 920
Lover's *Handy Andy*. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 178
Lytton's *Harold*. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 15
 " *Last Days of Pompeii*. 80
 " *Last of the Barons*. Introduction by R. G. Watkin. 18
 Rienzi. Introduction by E. H. Blakeney, M.A. 532
MacDonald's (George) *Sir Gibbie*. 678. (See also ROMANCE)
Mann's (Thomas) *Stories and Episodes*. Intro, by E. F. Bozman. 962
Manning's *Mary Powell and Deborah's Diary*. Introduction by Katherine
 Tynan (Mrs. Hinkson). 324
 Sir Thomas More. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 19
Marryat's *Jacob Faithful*. 618
 " *Mr. Midshipman Easy*. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 82
 " *Percival Keene*. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 358
 " *Peter Simple*. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 232
 " *The King's Own*. 580. (See also FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Maugham's (Somerset) *Cakes and Ale*. 932
Maupassant's *Short Stories*. Translated by Marjorie Laurie. Intro-
 duction by Gerald Gould. 907
Melville's (Herman) *Moby Dick*. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 179
 " " *Orao*. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 297
 " " *Typee*. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 180
Meredith's (George) *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel*. 916
Merimee's *Carmen*, with Prevost's *Manon Lescaut*. Intro, by Philip
 Henderson. 834

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY • CLASSIFIED LIST

FICTION—continued

- Mickiewicz's (Adam) Pan Tadeusz. 842
 Modern Short Stories. Edited by John Hadfield. 954
 Moore's (George) Esther Waters. 933
 Mulock's John Halifax, Gentleman. Introduction by J. Shaylor. 123
 Neale's (J. M.) The Fall of Constantinople. 655
 Paltock's (Robert) Peter Wilkins: or, The Flying Indians. Intro, by A. H. Bullen. 676
 Pater's Marius the Epicurean. Introduction by Osbert Burdett. 903
 Peacock's Headlong: Hall and Nightmare Abbey. 327
 Poe's Tales of Mystery and Imagination. Intro, by Padraic Colum. 336
 (See also POETRY)
 Prevost's Manon Lescaut, with Merimee's Carmen. Introduction by Philip Henderson. 834
 Priestley's Angel Pavement. 938
 Pushkin's (Alexander) The Captain's Daughter and Other Tales. Trans. by Natalie Duddington. 898
 Quiller-Couch's (Sir Arthur) Hetty Wesley. 864. (See also ESSAYS)
 Radcliffe's (Ann) Mysteries of Udolpho. Intro, by R. Austin Freeman. 2 vols. 865-6
 Reade's (C.) The Cloister and the Hearth. Intro, by A. C. Swinburne. 29
 Peg Woffington and Christie Johnstone. 299
 Richardson's (Samuel) Pamela. Intro, by G. Saintsbury. 2 vols. 683-4
 Clarissa. Intro, by Prof. W. L. Phelps. 4 vols. 882-5
 Russian Authors, Short Stories from. Trans, by R. S. Townsend. 758
 Sand's (George) The Devil's Pool and Francois the Waif. 534
 Scheffel's Ekkehard: a Tale of the Tenth Century. 529
 Scott's (Michael) Tom Cringle's Log. 710
 SIR WALTER SCOTT'S WORKS:
 Abbot, The. 124
 Anne of Geierstein. 125
 Antiquary, The. 126
 Black Dwarf and Legend of Mont-rose. 128
 Bride of Lammermoor. 3 29
 Castle Dangerous and the Surgeon's Daughter. 130
 Count Robert of Paris. 131
 Fair Maid of Perth. 132
 Fortunes of Nigel. 71
 Guy Mannering. 133
 Heart of Midlothian, The. 134
 Highland Widow and Betrothed. 127
 Ivanhoe. Intro, Ernest Rhys. 16
 Kenilworth. 135
 Monastery, The. 136
 Old Mortality. 137
 Peveril of the Peak. 138
 Pirate, The. 139
 Quentin Durward. 140
 Redgauntlet. 141
 Rob Roy. 142
 St. Ronan's Well. 143
 Talisman, The. 144
 Waverley. 75
 Woodstock. Intro, by Edward Garnett. 72
 (See also BIOGRAPHY and POETRY)
 Shchedrin's The Golovlyov Family. Translated by Natalie Duddington. Introduction by Edward Garnett. 908
 Shelley's (Mary Wollstonecraft) Frankenstein. 616
 Sheppard's Charles Auchester. Intro, by Jessie M. Middleton. 505
 Shorter Novels, Vol. I. Elizabethan and Jacobean. Edited by Philip Henderson. 824
 " " Vol. II. Jacobean and Restoration. Edited by Philip Henderson. 841
 " " Vol. III. Eighteenth Century (Beckford's Vathek, Walpole's Castle of Otranto, and Dr. Johnson's Rasselas). 856
 Sienkiewicz (Henryk). Tales from. Edited by Monica M. Gardner. 871
 Quo Vadis? Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 970
 Smollett's Humphry Clinker. Intro, by Howard Mumford Jones; Notes by Charles Lee. 975
 " Peregrine Pickle. 2 vols. 838-9
 " Roderick Random. Introduction by H. W. Hodges. 790
 Somerville and Ross: Experiences of an Irish R.M. 978
 Stendhal's Scarlet and Black. Translated by C. K. Scott Moncreiff. 2 vols. 94 5-6
 Sterne's Tristram Shandy. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 617
 (See also ESSAYS)
 Stevenson's Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. The Merry Men and Other Tales. 767

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY • CLASSIFIED LIST

FICTION—continued

- Stevenson's *The Master of Ballantrae and The Black Arrow.* 764
 „ *St. Ives.* Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 904
 „ *Treasure Island and Kidnapped.* 763
 (See also ESSAYS, POETRY, and TRAVEL)
 Surtees* *Jorrock's Jaunts and Jollities.* 817
 Swift's *Gulliver's Travels.* Unabridged Edition, with contemporary maps. Introduction by Harold Williams. 60
 Tales of Detection. Edited, with Introduction, by Dorothy L. Sayers. 928
 Thackeray's *Rose and the Ring and other Stories.* Intro. Walter Jerrold. 73 [359
 „ *Esmond.* Introduction by Walter Jerrold. 2 vols. 465-6
 „ *Newcomes.* Introduction by Walter Jerrold. 2 vols. 425-6
 „ *Pendennis.* Intro, by Walter Jerrold. 2 vols. 425-6
 „ *Roundabout Papers.* 687
 „ *Vanity Fair.* Introduction by Hon. Whitelaw Reid. 298
 „ *Virginians.* Introduction by Walter Jerrold. 2 vols. 507-8
 (See also ESSAYS)
 Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina.* Trans, by Rochello S. Townsend. 2 vols. 612-13
 „ *Childhood, Boyhood, and Youth.* Trans, by C. J. Hogarth. 591
 „ *Master and Man, and other Parables and Tales.* 469
 „ *War and Peace.* 3 vols. 525-7
 Trollope's (Anthony) *Barchester Towers.* 30
 „ *Dr. Thome.* 360
 „ *Framley Parsonage.* Intro, by Ernest Rhys. 181
 „ *The Golden Lion of Granpère.* Introduction by Sir Hugh Walpole. 761
 „ *The Last Chronicles of Barset.* 2 vols. 391-2
 „ *Phineas Finn.* Intro, by Sir Hugh Walpole. 2 vols. 1832-3
 „ *The Small House at Allington.* 361
 „ *The Warden.* Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 182
 Turgenev's *Fathers and Sons.* Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 742
 „ *Liza, or A Nest of Nobles.* Trans, by W. H. S. Ralston. 677
 „ *Smoke.* Translated by Natalie Duddington. 988
 „ *Virgin Soil.* Translated by Rochello S. Townsend. 528
 Twain's (Mark) *Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn.* Introduction by Christopher Morley. 976
 Voltaire's *Candida and Other Tales.* 936
 Walpole's (Hugh) *Mr. Perrin and Mr. Traill.* 918
 Wells's (H. G.) *Ann Veronica.* 977
 „ *The Time Machine and The Wheels of Chance.* 915
 Whyte-Melville's *The Gladiators.* Introduction by J. Mavrogordato. 523
 Wood's (Mrs. Henry) *The Channings.* 84
 Woolf's (Virginia) *To the Lighthouse.* Intro, by D. M. Hoare. 949
 Yonge's (Charlotte M.) *The Dove in the Eagle's Nest.* 329
 „ *The Heir of Redclyffe.* Intro. Mrs. Meynell. 362
 (See also FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
 Zola's (Emile) *Germinal.* Translated by Havelock Ellis. 897

HISTORY

- Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, The. Translated by James Ingram. 624
 Bede's *Ecclesiastical History, etc.* Introduction by Vida D. Scudder. 479
 Burnet's *History of His Own Times.* 85
 Carlyle's *French Revolution.* Introduction by H. Belloc. 2 vols. 31-2
 (See also BIOGRAPHY and ESSAYS) [Brogan, M.A. 965
 Chesterton's (Cecil) *History of the United States.* Edited by Prof. D. W. Creasy's *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World.* Intro, by E. Rhys. 300
 De Joinville (See Villehardouin)
 Duruy's (Jean Victor) *A History of France.* 2 vols. 737-8
 Finlay's *Byzantine Empire.* 33
 „ *Greece under the Romans.* 185
 Froude's *Henry VIII.* Intro, by Llewellyn Williams, M.P. 3 vols. 372-4
 „ *Edward VI.* Intro, by Llewellyn Williams, M.P., B.C.L. 375
 „ *Mary Tudor.* Intro, by Llewellyn Williams, M.P., B.C.L. 477
 „ *History of Queen Elizabeth's Reign.* 5 vols. Completing Froude's *History of England/* in 10 vols. 583-7
 (See also ESSAYS and BIOGRAPHY)

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY • CLASSIFIED LIST

HISTORY—*continued*

- Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Oliphant Smeaton, M.A. 6 vols. 434-6, 474-6
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY)
- Green's Short History of the English People. Edited and Revised by L. Cecil Jane, with an Appendix by R. P. Farley, B.A. 2 vols. 727-8
- Grote's History of Greece. Intro. by A. D. Lindsay. 12 vols. 186-97
- Hallam's (Henry) Constitutional History of England. 3 vols. 621-3
- Holinshed's Chronicle as used in Shakespeare's Plays. Introduction by Professor Allardyce Nicoll. 800
- Irving's (Washington) Conquest of Granada. 478
(*See also* ESSAYS and BIOGRAPHY)
- Josephus' Wars of the Jews. Introduction by Dr. Jacob Hart. 712
- Lutzwow's Bohemia: An Historical Sketch. Introduction by President T. G. Masaryk. Revised edition. 432
- Macaulay's History of England. 3 vols. 34-6
(*See also* ESSAYS and ORATORY)
- Maine's (Sir Henry) Ancient Law. 734
- Merivale's History of Rome. (An Introductory vol. to Gibbon.) 433
- Mignet's (F. A. M.) The French Revolution. 713
- Milman's History of the Jews. 2 vols. 377-8
- Mommsen's History of Rome. Translated by W. P. Dickson, LL.D. With a review of the work by E. A. Freeman. 4 vols. 542-5
- Motley's Dutch Republic. 3 vols. 86-8
- Parkman's Conspiracy of Pontiac. 2 vols. 302-3
- Paston Letters, The. Based on edition of Knight. Introduction by Mrs. Archer-Hind, M.A. 2 vols. 752-3
- Pilgrim Fathers, The. Introduction by John Masefield. 480
- Prynne's History of Germany. Translated by M. R. Brailsford. 929
- Political Liberty, The Growth of. A Source-Book of English History. Arranged by Ernest Rhys. 745 12 vols. 397-8
- Prescott's Conquest of Mexico. With Intro. by Thomas Seecombe, M.A. Conquest of Peru. Intro. by Thomas Seecombe, M.A. 301
- Sismondi's Italian Republics. 250
- Stanley's Lectures on the Eastern Church. Intro. by A. J. Grieve. 251
- Tacitus. Vol. I. Annals. Introduction by E. H. Blakeney. 273
- Vol. II. Agricola and Germania. Intro. by E. H. Blakeney. 274
- Thierry's Norman Conquest. Intro. by J. A. Price, B.A. 2 vols. 198-9
- Villehardouin and Joinville's Chronicles of the Crusades. Translated, with Introduction, by Sir F. Marzials, C.B. 333
- Voltaire's Age of Louis XIV. Translated by Martyn P. Pollack. 780

ORATORY

- Anthology of British Historical Speeches and Orations. Compiled by Ernest Rhys. 714
- Bright's (John) Speeches. Selected, with Intro., by Joseph Sturge. 252
- Burke's American Speeches and Letters. 340. (*See also* ESSAYS)
- Demosthenes: Select Orations. 546
- Fox (Charles James): Speeches (French Revolutionary War Period). Edited, with Introduction, by Irene Cooper Willis, M.A. 759
- Lincoln's Speeches, etc. Intro. by the Rt. Hon. James Bryce. 206
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY)
- Macaulay's Speeches on Politics and Literature. 399
(*See also* ESSAYS and HISTORY)
- Pitt's Orations on the War with France. 145

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

- A Kempis' Imitation of Christ. 484
- Ancient Hebrew Literature. Being the Old Testament and Apocrypha. Arranged by the Rev. R. B. Taylor. 3 vols. 253-6
- Aquinas, Thomas: Selected Writings. Edited by Rev. Fr. D'Arcy. 953
- Aristotle's Ethics. Translated by D. P. Chaso. Introduction by Professor J. A. Smith. 547. (*See also* CLASSICAL)
- Bacon's The Advancement of Learning. 719. (*See also* ESSAYS)

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY • CLASSIFIED LIST

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY—*continued*

- Berkeley's (Bishop) Principles of Human Knowledge. New Theory of Vision. With Introduction by A. D. Lindsay. 483
- Boehrae's (Jacob) The Signature of All Things, with Other Writings. Introduction by Clifford Bax. 569
- Browne's Religio Medici, etc. Intro, by Professor C. H. Hcrford. 92
- Bunyan's Grace Abounding and Mr. Badman. Introduction by G. B. Harrison. 815. (See also ROMANCE) 13 vols. 886-8
- Burton's (Robert) Anatomy of Melancholy. Intro, by Holbrook Jackson. 886-8
- Butler's Analogy of Religion. Introduction by Rev. Ronald Bayne. 90
- Chinese Philosophy in Classical Times. Translated and edited by E. R. Hughes. 973
- Descartes' (Rend) A Discourse on Method. Translated by Professor John Veitch. Introduction by A. D. Lindsay. 570
- Ellis's (Havelock) Selected Essays. Introduction by J. S. Collin. 930
- Gore's (Charles) The Philosophy of the Good Life. 924 [Ta«ore, 944
- Hindu Scriptures. Edited by Dr. Nico IMacnicol. Intro, by Rabindranath
- Hobbes's Leviathan. Edited, with Intro., by A. D. Lindsay, M.A. 691
- Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity. Intro, by Rev. H. Bayne. 2 vols. 201-2
- Hume's Treatise of Human Nature, and other Philosophical Works. Introduction by A. D. Lindsay, M.A. 2 vols. 548-9
- James (William): Selected Papers on Philosophy. 739
- Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. Translated by J. M. D. Meiklejohn. Introduction by A. D. Lindsay, M.A. 909
- Keble's The Christian Year. Introduction by J. C. Shairp. 690
- King Edward VI. First and Second Prayer Books. Intro, by the Right Rev. Korán, The. Rodwelfs Translation. 380 [E. G. S. Gibson. 448
- Latimer's Sermons. Introduction by Canon Becching. 40
- Law's Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life. 91
- Leibniz's Philosophical Writings. Selected and trans, by Mary Morris. Introduction by C. R. Morris, M.A. 905
- Locke's Two Treatises of Civil Government. Introduction by Professor William S. Carpenter. 751
- " Essay Concerning Human Understanding. Abridged and Edited by Raymond Wilburn. 984
- Malthus on the Principles of Population. 2 vols. 692-3
- Mill's (John Stuart) Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government. With Introduction by A. D. Lindsay, M.A. 482
- " Subjection of Women. (See Wollstonecraft, Mary, under SCIENCE)
- More's (Sir Thomas) Utopia. Introduction by Judge O'Hagan. 461
- New Testament. Arranged in the order in which the books came to the Christians of the First Century. 93
- Newman's (Cardinal) Apologia pro Vita Sua. Intro, by Dr. Charles Sarolea. 636. (See also ESSAYS)
- Nietzsche's Thus Spake Zarathustra. Trans, by A. Tille and M. M. Bozman. Paine's (Tom) Rights of Man. Introduction by G. J. Holyoake. 718 [892
- Pascal's Pensees. Translated by W. F. Trotter. Introduction by T. S. Eliot. 874 [403
- Ramayana and the Mahabharata, The. Translated by Romesh Dutt, C.L.E.
- Repan's Life of Jesus. Introduction by Right Rev. Chas. Gore, D.D. 805
- Robertson's (F. W.) Sermons on Christian Doctrine, and Bible Subjects. Each Volume with Introduction by Canon Burnett. 3 vols. 37-9
- Robinson's (Wade) The Philosophy of Atonement and Other Sermons. Introduction by Rev. F. B. Meyer. 637
- Rousseau's (J. J.) The Social Contract, etc. 660
- (See also ESSAYS and BIOGRAPHY)
- St. Augustine's Confessions. Dr. Pusey's Translation. 200
- " The City of God. John Healey's trans., with selection from Vives's Commentaries. Ed. R. V. G. Tasker, M.A., B.D. 2 vols. 982-3
- St. Francis: The Little Flowers, and The Life of St. Francis. 485
- Seeley's Ecce Homo. Introduction by Sir Oliver Lodge. 305
- Spinoza's Ethics, etc. Translated by Andrew J. Boyle. With Introduction by Professor Santayana. 481
- Swedenborg's (Emmanuel) Heaven and Hell. 379
- " " The Divine Love and Wisdom. 635
- " " The Divine Providence. 658
- " " The True Christian Religion. 893

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY • CLASSIFIED LIST

POETRY AND DRAMA

- Anglo-Saxon Poetry. Edited by Professor R. K. Gordon. 794
 Arnold's (Matthew) Poems. 334
 Ballads, A Book of British. Selected by R. B. Johnson. 572
 Beaumont and Fletcher, The Select Plays of. Introduction by Professor Baker, of Harvard University. 506
Bjdrnson's Plays. Vol. I. The Newly Married Couple, Leonardo, A Gauntlet. Trans. by R. Farquharson Sharp. 625
 Vol. II. The Editor, The Bankrupt, and The King. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 696
 Blake's Poems and Prophecies. Introduction by Max Plowman. 792
 Browning's Poems. Vol. I, 1833-44. Introduction by Arthur Waugh. 41
 Vol. II, 1844-64. 42
 „ Poems and Plays, Vol. IV, 1871-90. Intro. by M. M. Bozman. The Ring and the Book. Intro. by Chas. W. Hodel. 502 (964
 Burns's Poems and Songs. Introduction by J. Douglas. 94
 Byron's Poetical Works. New edition, reset. 3 vols. 486-8
 Calderon: Six Plays, translated by Edward FitzGerald. 819
 Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. Edited by Principal Burrell, M.A. 30'.
 Coleridge, Golden Book of. Edited by Stopford A. Brooke. 43
 (See also ESSAYS)
 Cowper (William), Poems of. Edited by H. I'Anson Fausset. 872
 (See also BIOGRAPHY)
 Dante's Divine Comedy (Cary's Translation). Specially edited by Edmund
 Donne's Poems. Edited by H. I'Anson Fausset. 867 [Gardner. 308
 Dry den's Poems. Edited by Bonamy Dobree. 910
 Eighteenth-Century Plays. Edited by John Hampden. 818
 Emerson's Poems. Introduction by Professor Bakewell, Yale, U.S.A. 715
 English Galaxy of Shorter Poems, The. From pre-Chaucer to A. E. Housman. Chosen and edited by Gerald Bullett. 959
 English Religious Verse. Edited by G. Lacey May. 937
 Everyman and other Interludes, including eight Miracle Plays. Edited by Ernest Rhys. 381
 FitzGerald's (Edward) Omar Khayyam and Six Plays of Calderon. 819
 Goethe's Faust. Parts I and II. Trans. and Intro. by A. G. Latham. 335
 (See also ESSAYS and FICTION)
 Golden Book of Modern English Poetry, The. Ed. by Thomas Caldwell. 921
 Golden Treasury of Longer Poems, The. New edition includes twentieth-century poems. 746
 Goldsmith's Poems and PlayR. Introduction by Austin Dobson. 415
 (See also ESSAYS and FICTION)
 Gray's Poems and Letters. Introduction by John Drinkwater. 628
 Hebbel's Plays. Translated, with an Introduction, by Dr. C. K. Allen. 694
 Heine: Prose and Poetry. 911
 Herbert's Temple. Introduction by Edward Thomas. 309
 Herrick's Hesperides and Noble Numbers. Intro. by Ernest Rhys. 310
 Ibsen's Brand. Translated by F. E. Garrett. 716
 „ Ghosts, The Warriors at Helgeland, and An Enemy of the People. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 552
 „ Lady Inger of Ostraat, Love's Comedy, and The League of Youth. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 729
 „ Peer Gynt. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 747
 „ A Doll's House, The Wild Duck, and The Lady from the Sea. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 494
 „ The Pretenders, Pillars of Society, and Rosmersholm. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 659
 International Modern Plays. Strindberg's Lady Julie, Hauptmann's Hannele, Capok's Life of the Insects, Cocteau's The Infernal Machine, Chiarelli's The Mask and the Face. Edited by Anthony Dent. 989
 Jonson's (Ben) Plays. Intro. by Professor Scheiling. 2 vols. 489-90
 Kalidasa: Shakuntala. Translated by Professor A. W. Ryder. 629
 Keats's Poems. Revised, reset, with Intro. by the editor, Gerald Bullett.
 Kingsley's (Charles) Poems. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 793 [101
 (See also FICTION and FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
 Langland's (William) Piers Plowman. 571
 Lessiug's Laocoon, Minna von Barnhelm, and Nathan the Wise. 843
 Longfellow's Poems. Introduction by Katherine Tynan. 382

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY • CLASSIFIED LIST

POETRY AND DRAMA—*continued*

- Marlowe's Plays and Poems. Introduction by Edward Thomas. 383
 Milton's Poems. Introduction by W. H. D. Rouse. 384 (See also ESSAYS)
 Minor Elizabethan Drama. Vol. I. Tragedy, Selected, with Introduction, by Professor Thorndike. Vol. II. Comedy. 491-2
 Minor Poets of the 18th Century. Edited by H. I'Anson Fausset. 844
 Minor Poets of the 17th Century. Edited by R. G. Howarth. 873
 Modern Plays. By Somerset Maugham, R. C. Sherriff, A. A. Milne, Noel Coward, and Arnold Bennett and E. Knoblock. 1142
 Moliere's Comedies. Introduction by Prof. F. C. Green. 2 vols. 830-1
 New Golden Treasury, The. An Anthology of Songs and Lyrics. 695
 Old Yellow Book, The. Introduction by Charles E. Hoddell. 503
 Omar Khayyam (The Rubaiyat of). Trans. by Edward FitzGerald. 819
 Palgrave's Golden Treasury. Introduction by Edward Hutton. 90
 Percy's Reliques of Ancient English Poetry. 2 vols. 118-9
 Poems of our Time. Edited by R. Church and M. M. Bozman. 981
 Poe's (Edgar Allan) Poems and Essays. Intro. by Andrew Lang. 791
 (See also FICTION)
 Pope (Alexander); Collected Poems. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 760
 Proctor's (Adelaide A.) Legends and Lyrics. 150
 Restoration Plays. Playb. by Dryden, Wycherly, Congreve, Otway. Farquhar, Vanbrugh, Etherege. 604
 Rossetti's Poems and Translations. Introduction by E. G. Gardner. 627
 Scott's Poems and Plays. Intro. by Andrew Lang. 2 vols. 550-1
 (See also BIOGRAPHY and FICTION)
 Shakespeare's Comedies. 153
 " Historical Plays, Poems, and Sonnets. 154
 " Tragedies. 155
 Shelley's Poetical Works. Introduction by A. H. Koszul. 2 vols. 257-8
 Sheridan's Plays. 95
 Silver Poets of the Sixteenth Century. Wyatt, Surrey, Sidney, Raleigh, Davies. Edited by Gerald Bullett. 985
 Spenser's Faerie Queene. Intro. by Prof. J. W. Hales. 2 vols. 443-4
 " Shepherd's Calendar and Other Poems. Edited by Philip Henderson. 879
 Stevenson's Poems, A Child's Garden of Verses, Underwoods, Songs of Tiavel, Ballads. 768. (See also ESSAYS, FICTION, and TRAVEL)
 Swinburne's Poems and Prose. Selected and Ed. by Richard Church. 901
 Synge's (J. M.) Plays, Poems, and Prose. Intro. by Ernest Rhys. 968
 Tehékhov. Plays and Stories. 941
 Tennyson's Poems, 1829-92. Ed. with Intro. by M. M. Bozman. 2 vols. 44, 626
 Twenty One-Act Plays. Selected by John Hampden. 947
 Webster and Ford. Plays. Selected, with Intro. by Dr. G. B. Harrison. 899
 Whitman's (Walt) Leaves of Grass. New, comprehensive edition. Edited by Emory Holloway. 573
 Wilde (Oscar): Plays, Prose Writings, and Poems. 858
 Wordsworth's Shorter Poems. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 203
 " Longer Poems. Note by Editor. 311

REFERENCE

- Atlas of Ancient and Classical Geography. Many coloured and line Maps; Historical Gazetteer, Index, etc. 451
 Biographical Dictionary of English Literature. 449
 Biographical Dictionary of Foreign Literature. 900
 Everyman's English Dictionary. Ed. by D. C. Browning, M.A. 776
 Literary and Historical Atlas. Many coloured and line Maps; full Index and Gazetteer. 553
 Africa and Australia. Do. 662
 Non-Classical Mythology, Dictionary of. 632
 Readers Guide to Everyman's Library. Revised edition, covering the first 950 vols. 889
 Roger's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases. 2 vols. 630-1
 Smith's Smaller Classical Dictionary. Revised and Edited by E. H. Wright's An Encyclopaedia of Gardening. 555 [Blakeney, M.A. 495]

ROMANCE

- Aucassin and Nicolette, with other Medieval Romances. 497
 Boccaccio's Decameron. (Unabridged.) Translated by J. M. Rigg.
 Introduction by Edward Hutton. 2 vols. 845-6
 Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. Introduction by Rev. H. E. Lewis. 204
 Burnt Njal, The Story of. Translated by Sir George Dasent. 558
 Cervantes' Don Quixote. Motteaux's Translation. Lockhart's Intro-
 duction 1 vols. 385-6
 Chretien de Troves: Eric and Knid. Translated, with Introduction and
 Notes, by William Wistar Comfort. 698
 French Medieval Romances. Translated by Eugene Mason. 557
 Geoffrey of Monmouth's Histories of the Kings of Binam. 577
 Grettir Saga, The. Newly translated by G. Ainslie Micht. 099
 Gudrun. Done into English by Margaret Armour. 880
 HeimskriDgla: The Olaf Sagas. Translated by Samuel Laing. Intro-
 duction and Notes by John Bevcridge. 717
 „ Sagas of the Norso Kings. Translated by Samuel Laing.
 Introduction and Notes by John Beveridge. 847
 Holy Graal, The High History of the, 445
 Kalevala. Introduction by W. F. Kirby, F.L.S., F.E.S. 2 vols. 259-60
 Le Sage's The Adventures of Gil Bias. Intro. by Anatolo De Bras. 2 vols.
 437-8
 Mabinogion, The. Translated by Thomas Jones and Gvlyn Jones. 97
 MacDonald's (George) Phantastes: A Faerie Romance. 732
 (See also FICTION)
 Malory's Le Morte d'Arthur. Intro. by Professor Rhyw. 2 vols. 45-6
 Morris (William): Early Romances. Introduction by Alfred Noyes. 261
 The Life and Death of Jason. 575
 Morte d'Arthur Romances, Two. Introduction by Lucy A. Paton. 634
 Nibelungs, The Fall of the. Translated by Margaret Armour. 312
 Rabelais, The Heroic Deeds of Gargantua and Pantagruel. Introduction
 by D. B. Wyndham Lewis. 2 vols. 826-7
 Wace's Arthurian Chronicles. Translated by Eugene Mason. Layamon's
 Brut. Introduction by Lucy A. Paton. 578

SCIENCE

- Boyle's The Sceptical Chymist. 559
 Darwin's The Origin of Species. Introduction by Sir Arthur Keith. 811
 (See also TRAVEL.) [by E. F. Bozman. 922
 Eddington's (Sir Arthur) The Nature of the Physical World. Introduction
 Euclid: the Elements of. Todhunter's Edition. Introduction by Sir
 Thomas Heath, K.C.B. 891
 Faraday's (Michael) Experimental Researches in Electricity. 576
 Galton's Inquiries into Human Faculty. Revised by Author. 263
 George's (Henry) Progress and Poverty. 560
 Hahnemann's (Samuel) The Organon of the Rational Art of Healing.
 Introduction by C. E. Wheeler. 663
 Harvey's Circulation of the Blood. Introduction by Ernest Parkyn. 262
 Howard's State of the Prisons. Introduction by Kenneth Ruck. 835
 Huxley's Essays. Introduction by Sir Oliver Lodge. 47
 Select Lectures and Lay Sermons. Intro. Sir Oliver Lodge. 498
 Lyell's Antiquity of Man. With an Introduction by R. H. Rastall. 700
 Marx's (Karl) Capital. Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. Intro-
 duction by G. D. H. Cole. 2 vols. 848-9
 Miller's Old Red Sandstone. 103
 Owen's (Robert) A New View of Society, etc. Intro. by G. D. H. Cole. 799
 Pearson's (Karl) The Grammar of Science. 939
 Rieardo's Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. 590
 Smith's (Adam) The Wealth of Nations. 2 vols. 412-13
 Tyndal's Glaciers of the Alps and Mountaineering in 1861. 98
 White's Selborne. New edition. Intro. and Notes by R. M. Lockley. 48
 Wollstonecraft (Mary), The Rights of Woman, with John Stuart Mill's
 The Subjection of Women. 825

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY • CLASSIFIED LIST

TRAVEL AND TOPOGRAPHY

- A Book of the 'Bounty.' Edited by George Mackaness. 950
 Anson's Voyages. Introduction by John Maseneld. 510
 Bates's Naturalist on the Amazon. With Illustrations. 446
 Belt's The Naturalist in Nicaragua. Intro, by Anthony Belt, F.L.S. 561
 Borrow's (George) The Gypsies in Spain. Intro, by Edward Thomas. 697
 " " The Bible in Spain. Intro, by Edward Thomas. 151
 " " Wild Wales. Intro, by Theodoro Watts-Dunton. 49
 (See also FICTION)
 Boswell's Tour in the Hebrides with Dr. Johnson. 387
 (See also BIOGRAPHY)
 Burton's (Sir Richard) First Footsteps in East Africa. 500
 Cobbett's Rural Rides. Introduction by Edward Thomas. 2 vols. 638-9
 Cook's Voyages of Discovery. 99
 Crevecœur's (H. St. John) Letters from an American Farmer. 640
 Darwin's Voyage of the Beagle. 104. (See also SCIENCE)
 Defoe's Tour through England and Wales. Introduction by G. D. H. Cole. 820-1. (See also FICTION)
 Dennis's Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria. 2 vols. 183-4
 Dufferin's (Lord) Letters from High Latitudes. 499
 Ford's Gatherings from Spain. Introduction by Thomas Okey. 152
 Franklin's Journey to the Polar Sea. Intro, by Capt. R. F. Scott. 447
 Giraldus Cambrensis: Itinerary and Description of Wales. 272
 Hakluyt's Voyages. 8 vols. 264, 265, 313, 314, 338, 339, 388, 389
 Kinglake's Eothen. Introduction by Harold Spender, M.A. 337
 Lane's Modern Egyptians. With many Illustrations. 315
 Mandeville's (Sir John) Travels. Introduction by Jules Bramont. 812
 Park (Mungo): Travels. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 205
 Peaks, Passes, and Glaciers. Selected by E. H. Blakeney, M.A. 778
 Polo's (Marco) Travels. Introduction by John Maseneld. 306
 Portuguese Voyages, 1498-1663. Edited by Charles David Ley. 986
 Robert's The Western Avernus. Intro, by Cunninghamham Graham. 762
 Speke's Discovery of the Source of the Nile. 50
 Stevenson's An Inland Voyage, Travels with a Donkey, and Silverado Squatters. 766. (See also ESSAYS, FICTION, and POETRY)
 Stow's Survey of London. Introduction by H. B. Wheatley. 589
 Wakefield's Letter from Sydney and Other Writings on Colonization. 828
 Waterton's Wanderings in South America. Intro, by E. Selous. 772
 Young's Travels in France and Italy. Intro, by Thomas Okey. 720

FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

- Aesop's and Other Fables: An Anthology from all sources. 657
 Alcott's Little Men. Introduction by Grace Rhys. 512
 " Little Women and Good Wives. Intro, by Grace Rhys. 248
 Andersen's Fairy Tales. Illustrated by the Brothers Robinson. 4
 " More Fairy Tales. Illustrated by Mary Shillabeer. 822
 Annals of Fainland. The Reign of King Oberon. 365
 " The Reign of King Cole. 366
 Asgard and the Norse Heroes. Translated by Mrs. Boulton. 689
 Baker's Cast up by the Sea. 539
 Ballantyne's Coral Island. 245
 " Martin Rattler. 246
 " Ungava. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 276
 Browne's (Frances) Granny's Wonderful Chair. Intro, by Dollie Radford. 112
 Bulfinch's (Thomas) The Age of Fable. 472
 " " Legends of Charlemagne. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 556
 Canton's A Child's Book of Saints. Illustrated by T. H. Robinson. 61
 (See also ESSAYS)
 Carroll's Alice in Wonderland, Through the Looking-Glass, etc. Illustrated by the Author. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 836
 Clarke's Tales from Chaucer. 537

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY • CLASSIFIED LIST

FOR YOUNG PEOPLE—*continued*

- Collodi's Pinocchio: the Story of a Puppet. 538
 Converse's (Florence) The House of Prayer. 923. (See also FICTION)
 Cox's (Sir G. W.) Tale of Ancient Greece. 721
 Dodge's (Mary Mapes) Hans Brinker; or, The Silver Skates. 620
 Edgar's Heroes of England. 471. (See also FICTION)
 Ewing's (Mrs.) Jackanapes, Daddy Darwin's Dovecot, illustrated by R. Caldecott, and The Story of a Short Life. 731
 Mrs. Overthrew's Remembrances. 730
 Fairy Gold. Illustrated by Herbert Cole. 157
 Fairy Tales from the Arabian Nights. Illustrated. 249
 Froissart's Chronicles. 57
 Gatty's Parables from Nature. Introduction by Grace Rhys. 158
 Grimm's Fairy Tales. Illustrated by R. Anning Bell. 5G
 Hawthorne's Wonder Book and Tanglewood Tales. 5
 (See also FICTION)
 Howard's Ratthn the Reefer. Introduction by Guy Pocock. 857
 Hughes's Tom Brown's School Days. Illustrated by T. Robinson. 58
 Ingelow's (Jean) Mopsa the Fairy. Illustrated by Dora Curtis. 619
 Jeff cries' (Richard) Bevis, the Story of a Boy. Intro. by Guy Pocock. 850
 Kingsley's Heroes. Introduction by Grace Rhys. 113
 „ Madam How and Lady Why. Introduction by C. I. Gardiner, M.A. 777
 „ Water Babies and Glaucus. 277
 (See also POETRY and FICTION)
 Kingston's Peter the Whaler. 6
 Three Midshipmen. 7
 Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare. Illustrated by A. Rackharn. 8
 (See also BIOGRAPHY and ESSAYS)
 Lear (and Others): A Book of Nonsense. 806
 Marryat's Children of the New Forest. 247
 „ Little Savage. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 159
 „ Masterman Ready. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 160
 „ Settlers in Canada. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 370
 (Edited by) Ratthn the Reefer. 857. (See also FICTION)
 Martineau's Feats on the Fjords, etc. Illustrated by A. Rackharn. 429
 Mother Goose's Nursery Rhymes. Illustrated. 473
 Plays for Boys and Girls. 18 plays, old and new. Ed. by John Hampden. 966
 Poetry Book for Boys and Girls. Edited by Guy Pocock. 894
 Reid's (Mayne) The Boy Hunters of the Mississippi. 582
 The Boy Slaves. Introduction by Guy Pocock. 797
 Ruffin's The Two Boyhoods and Other Passages. 688. (See also ESSAYS)
 Sewell's (Anna) Black Beauty. Illustrated by Lucy Kemp-Welch. 748
 Spyri's (Johanna) Heidi. Illustrations by Lizzie Lawson. 431
 Story Book for Boys and Girls. Edited by Guy Pocock. 934
 Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin. 371
 Swiss Family Robinson. Illustrations by Chas. Folkard. 430
 Verne's (Jules) Abandoned. 50 Illustrations. 368
 „ „ Dropped from the Clouds. 50 Illustrations. 367
 „ „ Five Weeks in a Balloon and Around the World in Eighty Days. Translated by Arthur Chambers and P. Desages. 779
 „ „ Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea. 319
 „ „ The Secret of the Island. 50 Illustrations. 369
 Yonge's (Charlotte M.) The Book of Golden Deeds. 330
 „ „ The Lances of Lynwood. Illustrated by Dora Curtis. 579
 The Little Duke. Illustrated by Dora Curtis. 470
 (See also FICTION)

