

## THE ANNEXATION OF CUBA.

The feeling in Cabinet circles relative to the annexation of Cuba does not appear to be very strong, and there is not the slightest ground for the supposition that the President is anxious for an extension of our territory in that direction. One of the strongest arguments against the annexation of the island is in the fact that the United States derives a revenue of thirty-six millions annually from duties on imports from that country alone. In the event of annexation there would be exactly a deficit to this amount, which would go a good way toward wiping out our surplus. All the talk on this question appears to be in the interest of some large importers, and the Government is looked on in exactly this light by influential parties here.

The above luminous paragraph recently appeared in the Washington correspondence of the New York Times. Who pays this alleged tax of thirty-six millions per annum? The consumers, of course. Are "Cabinet circles" aware that we have been in the habit, during the last twenty years, of shipping from twenty to thirty millions in gold annually to Europe, to pay our balances in favor of Cuba? And do they, and the Solons of the Times, not know that if we owned Cuba, or had reciprocity of trade with her even, we should be able to make our exchanges direct with that island, and sell her our produce, provisions, and manufactures annually to the above amount, instead of paying it in California gold, as at present? We want her sugar, coffee, cigars, tobacco, rum, &c., and she wants our products in return; but the Spanish differential duties against our commerce prohibit a direct exchange. So long as we have to pay this revenue on Cuban products, would it not be better to raise it by internal revenue tax, she being a State, and sell her our produce, than to pay it in the shape of customs duties? And by so doing, would not the Cubans and Americans both save the enormous forced taxes, expenses, and profits now levied by old Spain upon all articles imported into Cuba for consumption? We trust, for the honor of American statesmanship, that the Times correspondent does not promulgate this Cabinet policy "by authority."