a man's while to refine in India rather than send the sugar to be refined in this country, because of the 10s. fine imposed upon him by our fiscal law. That is the view we take of the matter.

We are not willing to give any premium for the employment of labour and capital in England rather than in India; but certainly we are not willing to be parties imposing a penalty upon the employment of labour and capital in England, as compared with India, which would in our view be the effect of an uniform duty. We have sought to amend the duty upon the principle laid down in the memorial of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce. The present duties upon sugar—I reject for a moment the liquid or semi-liquid classes, which it is not at this moment necessary to keep in view—the present duty upon sugar is distributed into four classes —refined, 18s. 4d.; white clayed, 16s.; brown clayed 13s. 10d.; Muscovado or below brown clayed, 12s. 8d. Now I must make a further reference to what are called "Dutch numbers," because although that may be speaking in a foreign tongue to society at large in England, yet the Dutch numbers are, in point of fact, the only universal language of the sugar trade of the world. If you tell a man what your duty is in Dutch numbers, that is construable into the trade terms of every tongue, and he knows exactly on what qualities of sugar your duty will fall. Our "refined" corresponds with the best of the Dutch numbers; the highest of which is 20—that is 19 and 20. The "white clayed or clayed to white clayed" corresponds with the numbers from 15 to 18; "clayed and brown clayed" corresponds with the numbers 11 to 14; "not equal to brown clayed" corresponds with the Dutch numbers 7 to 10; and nothing under 7 can possibly pay the duty which we now impose. We have had to consider whether it was desirable for us to alter essentially the dividing points between these classes. There are four classes, and there are, therefore, three dividing points. Those dividing points do not rest upon abstract principle. They rest upon knowledge and experience, and they are pretty well understood—at any rate, as well as they are capable of being understood—all over the world. We have, therefore, thought that it would be very undesirable to recast the duty *in toto*, and establish a completely new set of distinctions; consequently, we adhere to the dividing points between the classes which are now established, but we meet the grievance of the better unrefined sugars by diminishing the intervals of duty at the upper end of the scale, and we meet the grievance of the lower class of sugars by establishing a new class with a lower rate of duty than the rest for the purpose of making those sugars admissable which are now prohibited. The drawbacks, of course, will have to be altered in proportion to the duties. I should say also, with regard to a collateral point of some importance, that in