

"would be to levy on the value of the article at the place of original shipment, making a sharp distinction between raw and refined." We are not clear that we understand the meaning which Mr. Patterson attaches to the word "refined," but most assuredly the sugars manufactured in the British Colonies by the vacuum pan process are not "raw" sugars, and those who manufacture them will not concur with Mr. Patterson in his opinion, as to the "most satisfactory and equitable method" of levying duties. Furthermore, we may inform Mr. Patterson that the planters to whom we refer, exercise a very powerful, we might perhaps say, a controlling influence over legislation in the British sugar colonies. We wish it to be clearly understood that we are not expressing any opinion hostile to that of Mr. Patterson as to the policy of the Dominion of Canada; we are simply endeavoring to convince that gentleman that the sugar planters in the West Indies are not likely to concur with him in desiring "a sharp distinction" in the duties on raw and refined sugars. We shall not at present enter into the question of a "surtax upon sugar from any country which receives a bounty liability in the drawback allowed on exportation." Of course the West India planter could have no objection to such surtax. To him it is a matter of comparative indifference, whether he is excluded from the Canadian Market by American refined sugars coming in owing to excessive bounties, or by Canadian refined sugars protected by duties framed specially to secure their use. Moreover, Mr. Patterson has failed to notice two important facts: Firstly. There is now no duty on sugar in Great Britain, and if he will reflect for a moment he will perceive that the producers of such sugars as were exhibited from British Guiana at the Centennial Exhibition cannot send them to any other country, where inferior sugars compete with them at a great advantage in respect of duties. Secondly. That the majority of the best estates in the British West Indies are either owned by English proprietors or mortgaged to commercial houses, which control the destination of the produce. Before leaving this branch of our subject we must express surprise at Mr. Patterson's assertion that "the repeal of the sugar duties" in Great Britain was "a concession to a very extensive manufacturing interest in England and Scotland, that of sugar refining." In proof of this Mr. Patterson refers to the large amount of duty collected under the old system upon *unrefined* sugar. Of course while raw sugars were admitted

on very favorable terms, the refiners derived much more advantage than under the present system, when those raw sugars have to compete on equal terms with the West India crystallized sugars. The fact is, though Mr. Patterson seems to be unaware of it, that the abolition of the sugar duties was a measure in opposition to the interests of the sugar refiners. We have perhaps said enough on the sugar branch of the question, but we have been led to enter into it at greater length, because Mr. Patterson himself declares that in considering his subject "a gigantic spectre has glided into, and to some extent overshadowed the field of vision, and sugar duties in flaming characters seemed to be written on every wall and panel." We were not surprised that Mr. Patterson should be appalled by the spectre, but he may rest assured that it is even more formidable than he seems to imagine. There are one or two other points to which we would invite Mr. Patterson's attention. He seems to think that "the various import and export duties levied under the several colonial tariffs, scarcely any of the rates being the same," tends to obstruct commerce. Now in the first place it might have occurred to Mr. Patterson that these "various duties" do not obstruct trade with the United States. Secondly, he might have asked himself what real difference those duties, which are not differential, make to the Canadian shipper. Flour pays a duty of from 3 shillings to 5 shillings a barrel, but in each colony the duty is the same, no matter what the place of shipment, and so with all other articles. Canadians can ascertain the rates of duty as well as Americans, and Mr. Patterson has given them a great deal of valuable information on this head. Our point is that it makes no real difference to the exporter, whether in Canada or the United States, what may be the amount of a uniform revenue duty, which is no way protective, and which does not interfere with consumption. If Canada cannot compete with the United States in flour, lumber or other exports, the duty being 4 shillings per barrel, neither could she compete, if the duty were *nil*. Let it be clearly understood that to establish what is termed "reciprocal trade" Canada wants protection in the form of differential duties, and then the question can be argued; but it is childishness to dwell on the want of uniformity of tariffs in different colonies, each having its own system of raising a revenue. As Mr. Patterson places the West India export duties among the "obstructions" to trade, it may be desirable to offer a few remarks on those

duties. It is clear that the export tax falls on the producer who has to compete in the markets of the world with similar products not subject to such tax. There is no export tax in Barbadoes on sugar, and there is one in Trinidad. A Canadian or English importer of sugar would of course give the same price for the taxed as for the untaxed sugar. It will be found that the export taxes are merely a convenient mode of levying from the planter a contribution which he is specially called on to make, to defray the cost of importing labor. In some colonies, such as Barbadoes, the planter not requiring to import labor has no such contribution to make, while in others he pays it in another way. In no case can the export taxes be deemed an obstruction to trade.

We shall only advert to one other point treated by Mr. Patterson, viz., the geographical position. Under this head we are told that "the reciprocity treaty enabled our republican neighbors to import duty free from Canada most of the staples with which they supplied the requirements of Tropical and South American peoples." This is an extraordinary statement for so experienced a commercial man as Mr. Patterson. The reciprocity treaty had reference only to the natural products of both countries, and during its existence the products of both went into consumption in both on equal terms. But as regards exports to Tropical and South American peoples, Canadian products can be shipped in bond from New York and Baltimore on precisely the same terms as during the existence of the reciprocity treaty. Although St. Thomas is not as fair a place as Havannah, Barbadoes, Demerara, or Jamaica from which to calculate distances, still we accept Mr. Patterson's figures, and from them we learn that New York is 190 miles nearer than St. John, N.B., and 158 miles nearer than Halifax. Mr. Patterson should have stated the comparative distances between Toronto or London and New York and Halifax, and he might also have given the distances to Baltimore which competes very successfully with New York for the West India trade. A glance at the map would satisfy men of much less intelligence than Mr. Patterson that the St. Lawrence route can never compete even in summer with either Baltimore or New York for the trade of the Southern colonies. Surely Mr. Patterson is well aware that the trade from the West to British ports is only partially diverted from the American seaports to the St. Lawrence, and how then can he imagine that we can compete with success for the