

four. This one-sided trade has been going on for years with the United States, and the country has felt no inconvenience from it, nor can it possibly lead to inconvenience unless our importations are greater than the productions of the country are adequate to pay for. We do not produce gold and silver, and therefore if they are indispensable to purchase cheap goods with in the States, then our wheat and other productions must be sold in the best market we can find, (which at present is England,) and in part payment we take from her as much gold as we require to pay for our cheap purchases in the States.

Let no alarm, therefore, be felt about gold. Every commercial country requires a certain amount of it, and beyond that amount it is perfectly useless, and none will desire to keep it, because it can always be got when it is wanted, while a country has anything to give in exchange for it that any other country wants.

In conclusion, we may remark, in order to prevent misapprehension, that we do not desire this one-sided trade to be continued. We are by no means arguing in favour of it. We acknowledge we would much rather see a reciprocal free trade established. But, on the other hand, we insist that it would be madness on our part, utter stupidity, to avoid the cheap markets of the United States merely because they will take nothing from us in return but gold, inasmuch as, as we have already shewn, a sufficient supply of gold can always be procured elsewhere in exchange for our timber and corn; and therefore, instead of calling for further differential duties on articles coming from the United States, as certain individuals and journals seem desirous of doing, it is obviously the interest of this colony to have every differential duty removed, and that as speedily as possible, that we may get our wants supplied wherever we can do so cheapest.

We shall now add but a word more to explain that in this article we have often used the word "gold" for the sake of brevity, in place of *coin* or *bullion*, the sense implied being the same whichever words are used.

FREE TRADE AND BRITISH CONNEXION.

We resume the consideration of a question which has of late frequently been mooted:—How far the adoption of Free Trade principles in Great Britain, and as a consequence in her Colonies, is compatible with the nature of the connection subsisting between them.

A few years back, but one opinion would probably have existed on this point. Indeed, the whole colonial system of Great Britain appears to have been based on the principle of protection to colonial products in the British, in consideration of protection to British products in the colonial, markets. So indubitable was considered the soundness of this principle, and so conducive at all events to the prosperity of Britain, that the most eminent statesmen laid it down as a maxim, that colonists ought not to be permitted to manufacture for themselves the most ordinary articles; and the monopoly which the British manufactures enjoyed in British Colonies, has ever been held out as the only return to the Mother Country for the vast outlay attendant on their maintenance.

There can be no question that under this system of mutual protection in their respective markets, Great Britain and her Colonies have grown into the mightiest empire that the world ever saw; and it cannot, therefore, be wondered at, if any change in a system which has apparently been productive of such results, should awaken most serious apprehension, and encounter the most violent opposition. But, important as the Colonies of Great Britain manifestly are, as customers for her products and manufactures, as nurseries for her seamen, and as outlets and asylums for her redundant population, they are by no means the sole, or even perhaps the principal, elements which constitute her greatness. This truth was not until lately generally understood. The notion prevailed that the only constant market of export for British manufactures was to be found in her dependencies, and that, therefore, the true policy was to encourage commerce with them in preference to that with foreigners. But this fallacy is now exploded. Returns laid before the British Parliament have shewn the relative value of her commerce in all parts of the world, and have convinced the most sceptical, that the ratio of advance in her colonial, is by no means equal to that in her foreign, trade; they shew, moreover, that the trade with British North America and the West Indies, which in 1827 formed about 15 per cent, in 1844 had become only about 8 per cent, of the total exports of Great Britain.

This discovery, for such it may justly be entitled, of the relative value to Britain of her foreign, and of her colonial, trade, has superinduced a change in her whole commercial policy, and has seriously detracted from the force of the claims which we have hitherto put forth for protection in the British market.

We have alluded thus briefly to the causes which led to this thorough change in the Colonial policy of Great Britain, in order that our readers may accurately comprehend the nature of our

position, and not be led astray by the delusion that any apprehension of danger or detriment to her colonial trade, will induce her to revert to her former policy. Such a consummation, however much desired, cannot be expected. The struggle between the two contending parties in Britain has been too violent, to permit us to indulge the faintest hope that the advocates of Free Trade will, when flushed with success, in the very moment of victory, relinquish the prize for which they have contended, on account of any representations which we can make. Indeed, we have already obtained everything that we can reasonably ask or expect, by having our products of every description admitted into Britain at merely nominal duties, and by being treated in every respect rather as integral portions of the British empire, entitled to all the privileges of her subjects, than as dependencies.

This important question then naturally arises: Protection in the home market being withdrawn, shall we continue to derive such important advantages from our dependency on Great Britain, as to make it probable that our present relations as parent state and colony will be of long duration?

The opponents of Free Trade unhesitatingly furnish us with a negative answer to this question. They tell us, and truly, that the only cement which binds us to the mother country is self-interest. We agree with them that those high-sounding words, "attachment to the land of our birth," or to that of "our forefathers," serve little other purpose than to round a period when applied in the management of state affairs; the true maxim being, *non ubi nascor, sed ubi pascor*. We are perfectly convinced with them that the hallowed recollections of the past will give way to the stern realities of the present, and the cold calculations of the future. But we are not prepared, thence, to conclude that the tie which binds us to Great Britain, is severed; and for these, amongst other reasons:

First, That our commerce will still be protected, and our coasts and territory guarded, by her fleets and armies: and this, not at our expense, but at hers; not in such a manner as to detract from, but to add to, the sum of our national wealth.

Second, That this will continue to be the country to which the tide of emigration from the British Isles will continue to flow, fertilizing and enriching the land in its progress.

Third, That through the assistance of British credit and capital we shall be enabled to construct those public works which are necessary for our commerce, entering as we are about to do into competition with our powerful and enterprising neighbours.

These must be considered as positive advantages derived exclusively, and inseparably from our connection with Great Britain. Nor do we see anything to counteract them. Whilst we are not insensible to the benefits which this Colony has derived from the protection applied to our products, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the frequent changes which have been made in the nature and extent of that protection, have at all times detracted from these advantages, and have in some cases been productive of serious loss to the Colony. The new system is, in this respect, preferable to the old, that it promises to be permanent in its character. We shall no longer, as regards any article but Timber, enjoy exclusive privileges in the British Markets, and shall consequently not have any apprehension of the withdrawal of those privileges. A retrospective glance at the Corn Trade of this Province for the last ten years will, we think, indubitably establish the fact that the losses which have resulted from the frequent changes in the Corn Laws of Britain during that term, have far outweighed any profits derived by our mercantile class from the protection afforded to them. Under each of these changes a new system has sprung up here, and no sooner has it come to maturity than it has been necessary to subvert it and reconstruct another.

It would exceed the limits assigned to us for this article, to enter on the means which must now be adopted to meet the exigencies of the time. To a certain extent we have in previous numbers touched on this subject, but when the fate of the Corn Bill is decided in the British Parliament, and the precise character of its provisions are known, it will become necessary to examine the question more closely. At present *nil desperandum* is our motto: we rely on our natural and acquired advantages, and on the indomitable energy and untiring industry of our population.

HIGH TARIFFS AND THE SMUGGLING TRADE.

Sir Robert Peel, on the occasion of bringing before Parliament the great fiscal measure now in progress, argued in favour of a reduction of the duties on French goods, as the only means of putting a stop to smuggling. He affirmed that the greater part of the finer description of French manufactures imported for the London market are introduced in a contraband manner. These goods are subject to duties of 30 per cent. and upwards, and in consequence, an established smuggling trade has grown up, many houses in Paris and on the coast making it a practice to guarantee the delivery of such goods in London, for an allowance of half the duty, just in the same manner as the safe delivery of goods sent across the sea is guaranteed by insurance. The government has thus been defrauded of the