CANADIAN MANUFACTURER AND INDUSTRIAL WORLD
DEVOTED TO THE MANUFACTURING INTEREST OF THE DOMINION

ESTABLISHED IN 1880.

Published on the First and Third Fridays of each Month

BY THE

Canadian Manufacturer Publishing Co.

(LIMITED.)

63 FRONT STREET WEST, TORONTO.

FREDERIC NICHOLLS, *Managing Director.* J. J. CASSIDEY, *Editor.*

SUBSCRIPTION. - - - - $1.00 per year

ADVERTISING RATES SENT ON APPLICATION.

LOUISIANA SUGAR.

About six hundred sugar planters in Louisiana have complied with the law regarding applications for the bounty promised by the McKinley tariff for the manufacture of sugar in the United States. These applications show that a big crop is expected to be made there this year, there being an estimated production of 450,000,000 pounds of sugar, which, if realized, will call for the payment of $9,000,000 from the federal Treasury. Reports regarding the condition of the growing crop are that the expectations regarding it will be quite fully realized. The 600 planters, who have filed their applications for bounty, expect to realize from it an average of about $15 000 each. Of course many will not receive so much, but one large concern calculate that they will receive as much as $240,000. It is said that the impetus given to the sugar industry in Louisiana is stimulating the foundrymen and manufacturers of machinery, who are rushed with orders for work in their lines, and that the importation of sugar making machinery into the port of New Orleans, coming mainly from Germany and France, are exceedingly large, amounting in value to millions of dollars.

What is said of the production of sugar in Louisiana applies with greater or less force to many other portions of the United States, particularly to California where there are several large concerns engaged in sugar beet farming and in the manufacture of the beets into sugar, and also to Nebraska where there is one of the largest sugar factories in the world.

Referring to the figures given above regarding the production of sugar in Louisiana this year, it will be seen that the planters in that State alone expect to produce twice as much sugar as the entire consumption of sugar in Canada. This is cane sugar, but the California and Nebraska industries are beet sugar, and this emphasizes the fact that sugar beets can be grown in Canada to quite as good advantage as in the States named, and that there is no good reason why Canada should not be quite as active in the production of beet sugar as the United States. Under the McKinley tariff a bounty of two cents per pound is guaranteed to the producers of sugar in the United States for a period of fifteen years; and no matter what changes may occur in political parties in the meantime it will be impossible for the Government to withdraw the bounty. It is the opinion of those capable of judging that before the expiration of the fifteen years the sugar making industry in the United States will be so well established that the supply from that source will about supply the domestic demand.

There is no reason why a similar condition should not prevail in Canada. If Canada produced her own sugar, and a bounty of two cents per pound was paid for it, with a production of 250,000,000 pounds per year $5,000,000 would be distributed among the farmers who grew the beets and those employed in their manufacture into sugar. Why not have the industry? As it is those who have already invested in the industry in Quebec in building factories and equipping them with expensive machinery, with the expectation that they would receive some sort of protection as guaranteed to them by the National Policy, are told by the Government that they have but the present year to live—that their industry is to be killed and their investments sacrificed. It is not yet too late, however, for the Government to retrace their steps in this matter.

TARIFF FOR PROTECTION *VS.* TARIFF FOR REVENUE.

The Toronto *Globe* labors under a misapprehension of facts as regards the repeal of the sugar duties in the United States. It says that that repeal was a confession on the part of American protectionists that protection to sugar had failed, and explains by saying that when taxing sugar was begun (in 1816) it was predicted that with a little protection for a little while it could be raised as far north as the Ohio river. Whatever views may have prevailed in the United States seventy-five years ago regarding the possibility of raising sugar as far north as the Ohio river, the *Globe* knows, or should know, that no such views prevail at this time, or have prevailed there since the United States adopted the policy of protection. Louisiana is the only State of the Union in which cane sugar is the chief crop and industry, although the cane is cultivated to greater or less extent in all the regions bordering on the Gulf of Mexico. But the cultivation of the sugar cane was never a success as a commercial crop north of those regions, and it has always been well understood that no measure of tariff protection could ever develop the industry even as far north as the