

tral trade (P. 23, 59.)* — and to bring the Dutch treaty as evidence against our belligerent rights. (P. 11, 37.)†.

Reverting to the question of policy for a moment, this author argues, that “if the finances of France be the object in contemplation, American *purchase* of wine and brandy must be more beneficial than her *sale* of indigo and cotton:” (P. 48.) and on this mistake of his the question a good deal depends. The transporting the commerce of the colonies to the mother country, is rather the remittance of rents to the great body of non-resident proprietors, than the exchange of colonial for European commodities. (Inquiry into the State of the Nation, 1806 — P. 190.) Instead therefore of America carrying on a trade *with* France, the intervention of her capital (if her capital be *bonâ fide* employed, as this gentleman says it is, P. 51.) is only a fraudulent device to enable the French West-Indian planter to have his rents remitted him; and instead of weakening France, by selling her objects of luxury and expense, this covering commerce enriches her to the sum of its total amount; whereas a common trade is beneficial only to the rate of profit or commission upon it.

* See P. 56 of this tract.

† See P. 20 and 34 of this tract.