

size of it may not be disclosed." Having shown the anaconda-like grip that the American sugar trust have upon that country all through the operation of the McKinley tariff, and what it would be if the Senate amendment is accepted, the Gazette very innocently enquires, "Is that the kind of legislation the people of Canada desire?"

Our answer to this question, is the people of Canada should not be subjected to any legislation that would make such a condition possible; and at the same time we would like for the Gazette to explain how it is possible that the American sugar trust can exist and flourish in the way pointed out, under a duty of only 5/10 cent per pound, not impossible that a similar trust should not exist and flourish in Canada where for years the duty was 60 per cent. higher, and where, even under our newly revised tariff, it is 28 per cent. higher. This is the conundrum we respectfully ask the Gazette to solve. Will it enlighten us?

In the discussion of this Canadian sugar question what is wanted is facts. The Gazette speaks of the ability of the American sugar trust to rob their treasury of \$30,000,000 per year, but it is remarkably quiet with regard to the ability of the Canadian sugar refiners to rob our treasury of a proportionate amount by similar means. The consumption of sugar in Canada is, per capita, quite as great as in the United States, and therefore the population of the two countries, being as 12 to 1, it is probable that in the same proportion Canada is affording our refiners to rake off some \$2,500,000 per year by means of an improperly adjusted tariff.

Canadian refiners have the ability to manufacture refined sugar quite as cheaply as American or British or German refiners, and the cost of refining here is probably no more than in any of the countries named. As has been heretofore shown in these pages, from facts made known to the world by the report of a special committee of the British House of Commons, the cost of refining in that country, including waste from impurities in the raw material in its conversion into granulated, is only about fifteen cents per one hundred pounds. Considering the difference in circumstances, a very generous allowance for cost of refining in Canada would be twenty-five cents per hundred pounds, and the difference between this cost and the amount of protection, say thirty-nine cents, multiplied by the amount consumed, would seem to indicate the rake off of the refiners over and above what they should be allowed to receive. It may serve the purpose of the Gazette to tell us what terribly greedy fellows those American refiners are; but from the same standpoint the conviction forces itself that the Canadian refiners are in the same category.

PROFITS OF SUGAR REFINING.

Under the McKinley duty of 5-10 cent per pound upon refined sugar, the American Sugar Trust has become an Old Man of the Sea who the American people and their Congress find difficult if not impossible to throw off. To enable a better appreciation of the situation it should be remembered that in Great Britain and Germany the cost of refining raw sugar of 96 degrees of purity into absolutely pure granulated sugar, including the loss from impurities in the raw, is only about fifteen cents per one hundred pounds of refined. This cost includes all charges, both for labor, charges for management, interest upon investment,

etc. In these countries labor is cheaper and interest upon money is lower than in the United States or Canada; but in both these latter countries the machinery used in refining is, or should be, equal to the most efficacious in use on the other side of the Atlantic. Taking these facts into due consideration, it is, we think, fair to allow that the cost of refining in the United States and Canada should not cost more than one-fourth of a cent per pound, or 25 cents per hundred pounds, or \$5 per ton of 2,000 pounds.

As a study from quotations of prices of sugar in the United States, Willett & Gray, of New York, who are accepted in the trade as statistical sugar experts, in a recently issued circular gives a series of comparative tables in which are given the average monthly and yearly quotations of 96 degrees centrifugal sugar and of granulated sugar, with the difference between the two grades, adjusted to net cash prices; and they give the gratuitous information that the facts discovered by a study of their figures are very suggestive of the benefits and economy of the American sugar industry. We reproduce a table of yearly averages, showing the cost of sugar, 1880 to 1893, both inclusive:

NET CASH YEARLY AVERAGE.			
	96 deg. Centrifugal.	Granu- lated.	Differ- ence.
1880.....	8.206	9.602	1.396
1881.....	8.251	9.667	1.426
1882.....	7.797	9.234	1.437
1883.....	7.423	8.506	1.083
1884.....	5.875	6.780	0.923
1885.....	5.729	6.441	0.712
1886.....	5.336	6.117	0.781
1887.....	5.245	6.013	0.768
1888.....	5.749	7.007	1.258
1889.....	6.433	.640	1,207
1890.....	5.451	6.171	0.720
1891.....	3.863	4.691	0.828
1892.....	3.311	4.346	1.035
1893.....	3.689	4.842	1.153
Average.....	5.882	6.932	1.052

It is evident from the above table that the sugar refining industry has its good and bad years, as do all other industries. Undoubtedly the cost of refining has been somewhat reduced during the period under review, but, says Messrs. Willett & Gray, it is evident that the saving thus made has been shared with, if not altogether given to consumers.

As will be observed by the above table, the difference in price between 96 degrees centrifugal sugar, commercially known as raw sugar not higher than number 16 Dutch standard, and granulated, for the term of years indicated, averaged \$1.05 per hundred pounds; and Messrs. Willett & Gray inform us that the cost of refining ranges from 50 to 62½ cents per hundred pounds. It should be remembered that Messrs. Willett & Gray's standpoint in discussing any phase of the sugar question is identical with that of the sugar trust. But even from this point of view they show that the difference between the cost of refining and the selling price of sugar is about 50 cents per hundred pounds, which, quite singularly, is precisely the amount of protection afforded by the tariff, and which difference, admitting the correctness of their claim as to the cost of refining, indicates the amount of profits that accrue in the business. But as we have shown, this claim of 50 cents