

is not perceived that, raise the revenue as you will, the aggregate of prices must remain enhanced by the aggregate of taxation; and that a burden is not got rid of by shifting it from one shoulder to the other. There is no allowance made, either, for the very practical consideration which the present writer begs to submit to the public: viz., that while it is certain that all direct taxes and internal revenue duties are paid *wholly* by our own people, there is found, in the every-day talk of business men, Free Traders included, and still more in the way they generally *act* on tariff questions, good ground for the belief that, taking any national tariff as a whole, some part of the burden of customs duties really falls upon the foreign producer, to that extent relieving home consumers. But to return to Mr. Walker. His extraordinary illustration given above, alarms even Free-Trade writers here, who seem to fear that their champion is proving too much. The journal already quoted thus betrays its uneasiness as to the soundness of Mr. Walker's logic:

"If this showing does not contain some fallacy which is not apparent upon the face of it, it would be more profitable to pay a bounty than to collect a duty. This view of the case is startling enough, but illustrates in true colours the unhealthy principle that lies at the bottom of the cry for Protection."

Another Canadian Free Trade journal, also evidently staggered by Mr. Walker's *too* powerful argument, thus comments:

"But we think that Mr. Walker has not represented the case exactly as it stood. Was the sugar crop to which he referred really worth \$25,000,000? It does not appear on the face of it to have been so, for that crop, as we infer from his remarks, was raised under a protective duty of twenty-four per cent., and therefore, according to the bonus system which Mr. Walker suggests, the premium ought not to be paid on the fictitious value created by the tariff, but upon the actual market value, less the import duty on the foreign article, which, in the case supposed, would have saved an additional million of dollars, or thereabouts, to the public: nor does it appear from the above extract, why the people had paid over fourteen millions, when the government received less than five. *The loss to the consumers, of the nine millions, is not, we think, very clearly made out—in fact, it is not made out at all*, and until this point is clearly established, the argument from such reasoning, in favour of the bounty system, is