

value, which means that the price of everything rises more and more until the level is reached in which it pays to import goods, notwithstanding the protection duty. Meanwhile those who follow industries, as for instance, in Canada, agriculture, that do not need protection are not only taxed for the benefit of the manufacturer of the protected articles, but are indirectly taxed in the lessened value that the money price they receive has, when they get it, and in the heightened wages they have to pay to labourers. All accumulation of money beyond the legitimate results of unrestricted commerce tends to produce this result to a greater or less degree.

One may see the retort playing on the lip of the Protectionist that in that case the labourers in protected industries share in the benefit. One industry protected tends to heighten all labour. We admit this so far, but it must be borne in mind that whatever the *nominal* value of wages, the actual purchasing power is pulled down by everything that tends to heighten the price of commodities. This result is helped by this very heightening of wages, but much more by protection which is at the root of the whole disorder. Here may be noticed a very curious form, in which the accusation that Britain is still protectionist is couched—that Britain “has done nothing to help the free distribution of labour in the world—has left her children to drift from her, that is all.” If Britain was doing anything to help this emigration, it would be equivalent to a bounty system, and therefore false political economy. Were Britain guilty of this, her colonists of the labouring class, might well protest against having the market for their labour destroyed by the importation of others. Let the law of supply act simply and without restriction in the demand of the Free Trader. If Britain were to pay her labourers to leave her for Canada, the burden of supporting the manufacturers of protected industries would be shifted on to the shoulders of the poor labourer, that would be the main results attained. Certainly the notion that the British tax-payer should be burdened in order that the Colonies should be able to drive him out of the markets of the world is one that involves all the fallacies of protection, and has not its specious appearance. Even that the Canadian Government should offer a bounty to immigrants’ labour, would not be true Free Trade, but might be easily excused and so far defended. But the true parties to pay this bounty should not be the Government of Canada, but the manufacturers’ association.

In discussing such questions, which involve scientific as well as practical issues, this *tu quoque* mode of argument is meaningless. Britain may be foolish enough in regard to many questions in politics and political economy, but that affords no reason why Canada should be so. The argument of Free Traders all along has been that it would be better for Canada to have “unrestricted competition.” They have striven by scientific argument to show this. It is no answer to this to say that Britain will be benefitted by Canadian free trade; it ought to be shown that Canada would be the worse for it. Nor is it an answer that Britain has not absolute free trade—even if it were true, for if the argument is valid Britain is foolish to the extent that it does not admit “unrestricted competition,” and that folly ought to be no inducement to Canada to be equally foolish. Nay, if Britain is benefitted by free trade, and Canada none the worse—still more if Canada is the better for it also—that ought to be an argument *for* and not *against* its adoption. And if Britain under old tradition and hampered by ancient vested interests is compelled to preserve a foolish Protectionist policy—which, however, is not the case—Canada, young, free and vigorous, ought by her example to strengthen the hands of British Free Traders.

I am not conceited enough to imagine that any words of mine will have induced anyone who had an interest in maintaining these protective duties to desist; my utmost hope is that some of those who have no interest in their maintenance may recognise their gross injustice to the community at large and be led to lift up his voice against them. Certainly this protective tariff is fraught with commercial mischief and that will be seen ere many years are over, unless it is speedily repealed.

Stirling.

BEET ROOT SUGAR.

No. II.

We have much to learn and much to do in this country in order to properly use the great gifts of nature which lie all around and about us. We will continue our examination on the beet sugar question by exposing the state of this industry in Germany, and beg our readers will look at it alongside of our remarks on the subject so far as France is concerned.

German sugar makers of note, after having been made acquainted with the quality of our fields and of the beets grown thereon, expressed themselves that *Providence has done more for us than we have improved or done for ourselves, and that if they had but a part of our lands, they would raise sugar to supply the world.*

The statistics below are all from official sources, and tell that in the North of Germany (Zollverein) there existed in 1837, 122 beet sugar factories, which had already in 1867 (30 years) increased to 296 factories, of which 257 were in Prussia proper. These latter worked up annually into sugar and molasses

2,541,635 tons of beet roots, and the next six years we have to record a further increase of 33⅓ per cent., a crop exceeding three million tons of this precious root. It is not our object unnecessarily to tire out our readers with figures, but we cannot refrain from giving the particulars, to show to what an extent this industry in Germany has competed during the past five years with the “headquarters” of cane sugar, Cuba.

	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.
Product of cane sugar (Cuba)....	690,900	572,000	505,553	530,598	645,883
Product of beet sugar (Germany)...	250,421	346,048	291,334	383,009	420,495

This relates only to North Germany; if we would add thereto the product of Austria (of which hereafter) it would prove that the Germanic Empires produce to-day a far greater quantity than Cuba itself. The increase was steady, not even interrupted by the bad crop of 1879. While in Cuba a steady decrease took place, the crop of Germany nearly doubled in five years. Similar increase was noted in all the other beet sugar producing countries.

It cannot but be interesting and instructive to our readers if we expose to them the way that the German Government derives taxes out of this industry, and how very different from France. While the latter taxes the produce, the former taxes the raw material. While France places an excise duty of 6⅓ cts. per lb. on raw sugar, as we have shown in our previous article, the “paternal” Government of Germany, in taxing the beets, stimulates at the same time the raising of the sweetest beets possible. Science and agricultural chemistry assisted the farmer to raise the percentage of saccharine matter on a large scale as high as 17 per cent., whereas the French beets in exceptional cases reach 13 per cent. After liberal protection and many years of exemption, a small excise was levied, which gradually increased—in fact from year to year—until it is now thirty-five times as the first tax in 1830. In that year the Budget showed an income of 40,000 thalers or \$30,000; and since 1870 the income has exceeded annually the enormous sum of \$15,000,000 (our money) after deducting drawbacks on exported sugars. As we have shown the production has doubled even since 1875, we can easily understand what an important item this industry exhibits in the Budget of the German Empire.

To us, who complain of being too much taxed, it should be interesting to learn that to-day each ton of sugar beet as received by the sugar works pays an excise duty of exactly \$4 (our money). The rising scale was thus:—

1830.....	\$0.12½ per ton.
1836.....	0.25 “
1844.....	0.75 “
1850.....	1.50 “
1853.....	3.00 “
1859.....	3.75 “
1869.....	4.00 “

In order to convey to our readers a correct idea of the value of such an industry, the entire crop of 1875 (bearing in mind that even since 1873 to this day the crop has doubled) amounted to 59,172,000 thalers, that of the beet pulp and molasses to 7,199,200—together in our money nearly \$50,000,000.

Before we further unroll before our readers the astonishing picture of the progress of this industry unknown here, we beg to remind them that the chief object of this truthful exposition is, to point our thinking and intelligent men to the fact, that Canada has all the elements, not only to do as well, but infinitely better, and we will in due time bring forward incontestible proofs of this assertion. We will show, also, that while the before mentioned crop of Germany was produced on an area of 18.30 square miles of beet fields, equal to 2,841,850 acres of our measurement, we have even in the Province of Quebec fit and proper land in abundance to more than triple the German crop.

But to resume. It is not France, Belgium and North Germany alone which produce beet sugar; we see even Sweden, Norway, Russia and Austria are producing considerably beyond their own wants. We have before us a report of the 25th anniversary of the Austrian Sugar Growers’ and Manufacturers’, held in May last in Vienna. The President mentioned on that occasion: “Twenty-five years ago we were struggling for existence, had to ask the help of the State—to-day ours is the Giant Industry of the empire—two million tons of beets are produced, our exports of sugar exceeds two hundred million pounds; 70,000 head of cattle surplus are annually fattened with the beet pulp; the railways of the empire transport four million tons merchandise over its roads, one million of which are coals; 229 factories employs 120,000 hands! Even Russia, with a climate like our own, is not merely producing hemp, tallow and Nihilists, but beet sugar in enormous quantities. If we had not official papers before us we would hardly credit it, that that country produces now annually 220,000 tons.”

We shall close this enumeration in giving here the figures of the four principal producing countries:—

	1873-4. Tons.	1874-5. Tons.	1875-6. Tons.	1876-7. Tons.	1877-8. Tons.	1878-9. Tons.
France.....	396,000	450,000	462,000	243,000	398,000	390,000
Germany.....	288,000	250,000	346,000	291,000	383,000	420,500
Austria.....	169,000	120,000	208,000	247,000	330,000	340,000
Russia.....	150,000	222,000	245,000	250,000	220,000	215,000
	1,003,000	1,042,000	1,261,000	1,031,000	1,331,000	1,365,500