advanced or refined manufactures, even of Colonial produce, and compelled them to purchase of British merchants and manufacturers all goods of that kind for which they had occasion.*

Failure of system to benefit the mother-country.

Looking back on the laws imposing such restrictions by the light of modern knowledge, the merest tyro in Political Economy can afford to laugh at the failure of a system that proposed to enrich the mother-country by carrying on a trade which was unprofitable to the colony, and which was based on the principle that an impoverished dependent colony was a better customer than a prosperous independent country.

At any rate, this system has long been abandoned, and England, ashamed of her selfish endeavours to enrich herself at the expense of the Colonies, testified her penitence by going into the opposite extreme, and admitting into her ports Colonial wine, Colonial timber, and Colonial sugar at a less duty than similar commodities, the growth of foreign countries.

When this last barrier of protection yielded to the assault of the free-traders, the generosity of England found a different channel. In 1854 she made a treaty with the United States by which goods, the produce of the United States or of the British North American provinces, were admitted into either country absolutely free from duty. In other words, Canadians or New Brunswickers bought and sold without the restrictions imposed upon Englishmen; while the latter, even in time of peace, were paying annually no less a sum than a million and a half for the protection of British North America and of the West Indies.† Look again at the

* Smith's "Wealth of Nations," by McCulloch, book iv., chap. 7, p. 261.

† McCulloch's Commercial Dictionary, "Colony Trade," 3rd edit., 1859.